

THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS TO THE WICKED
IN THE AMERICAN GREAT AWAKENING AND THE KOREAN REVIVALS

by

Paul ChulHong Kang

Dissertation

Presented for the Degree of Doctor of Theology

at the University of Stellenbosch



Promoter: Prof P. F. Theron (University of Stellenbosch)
Co-promoter: Prof D. Clair Davis (Westminster Theological Seminary)

April 2005

Abstract

This study considers the doctrine of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness in both the Great Awakening and the Second Great Awakening. It examines the role of this doctrine in the development of the New England Revival and the Second Great Awakening, and its impact on the American church and society.

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

Signature:

PC Kang

Date:

Abstract

This study considers the doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in both the Great Awakening and the Korean revivals through the six revivalists from the view of the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification: Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Yong-Do Lee, and Sung-Bong Lee.

The key question is whether they maintain the Reformation doctrine of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness, affirming the *sola fide-sola gratia* language of the Reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin. The prime concern facing the six revivalists is the question of the status of humanity and the necessity of Christ's righteousness for *forensic* justification. It is of the utmost importance to see that justification by faith alone is fully embedded in the understanding of union with Christ.

Jonathan Edwards stood firmly against any attempt to shrink God's free grace down to the size of human works in justification, following closely the Reformation doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness. Edwards elucidated Adamic and Christological *forensic* union in terms of divine constitution. He firmly held that through union with Christ Christ's *alien* righteousness is *legally* transferred or reckoned to the believers. Timothy Dwight, standing in a quite different tradition, rejected Edwards's notion

of justification that justification is an absolute unmerited gift of God, apart from human works. Dwight affirmed neither prevenient grace nor justification in the Reformation terms of *sola fide*, *sola gratia*, *sola scriptura*, *solus Christus*, *sola Deo Gloria*, a *iustitia aliena* (an alien righteousness), and a *iustitia extra nos* (a righteousness apart from us).

By stressing the power of the human will, Sun-Ju Kil clearly thought that justification is exclusively an act of human beings. Kil's view of the act of faith alone made all the difference in imputation, connecting the wicked to the righteousness of Christ. Ik-Doo Kim also departed from the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification in failing to present the implications of Christ's imputed righteousness. Kim's doctrine of the power of prayer determined his view of justification. Kim's notion of repentance centered on the act of faith through prayer, which made Luther's *sola fide* a human work or accomplishment in the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Yong-Do Lee placed his understanding of the justification of the wicked within the setting of the principle of oneness with Christ, with which he laid the foundation for the double exchange of life in his theology. Lee did not recognize a necessary connection between justification and the free grace of the sovereign God. Although Sung-Bong Lee found considerable depth in the imputation of Christ's righteousness in comparison with the three Korean revivalists, he failed effectively to

distinguish between justification and sanctification. Lee's decisive proposal of union with Christ cannot be identified as the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* imputation. This study suggested that the five revivalists except Jonathan Edwards were unwilling to favor the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification regarding original sin, *alien* righteousness, union with Christ, and the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Opsomming

In hierdie studie word die *forensiese* siening van die leer van die regverdiging tydens die Amerikaanse *Great Awakening* en die Koreaanse *revivals*, in die teologie van Jonathan Edwards en Timothy Dwight enersyds, en Sun-Jul Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Young- Do Lee en Sung-Bong Lee andersyds, ondersoek.

‘n Kernkwessie is die vraag of hierdie opwekkingspredikers en teoloë getrou bly aan die Reformatoriese leer van die toerekening van Christus se geregtigheid soos dit tot uitdrukking kom in die aksent op *sola fide – sola gratia* by Maartin Luther en Johannes Calvyn. Sentraal is die vraag na die staat van die mens en die noodsaaklikheid van Christus se geregtigheid vir forensiese regverdiging. Dit is van die grootste belang om te verstaan dat regverdiging deur die geloof alleen, onlosmaaklik verbonde is met die verstaan van ons eenheid met Christus.

In aansluiting by die Reformatoriese leer van die forensiese toerekening van Christus se geregtigheid, verset Jonathan Edwards hom teen enige poging om deur goeie werke God se vrye genade te kompromiteer. Edwards verstaan Adamitiese en Christologiese forensiese eenheid in terme van goddelike konstitusie. Hy hou vas aan die oortuiging dat op grond van die gelowiges se eenheid met Christus, laasgenoemde se geregtigheid juridies oorgedra en toegereken word aan eersgenoemde. Timothy Dwight staan binne ‘n heeltemal ander tradisie en verwerp Edward se opvatting van regverdiging as ‘n totaal onverdiende gawe van God onafhanklik van menslike werke. Dwight onderskryf nòg die leer van die voorafgaande genade, nòg die Reformatoriese leer van die regverdiging in terme van *sola fide, sola gratia, sola scriptura, solus Christus, soli Deo Gloria*. Ook aanvaar hy nie die

iustitia aliena (vreemde geregtigheid) en die *iustitia extra nos* ('n geregtigheid buite ons) nie.

As gevolg van sy aksent op die krag van die menslike wil is dit duidelik dat Sun-Ju-Kil regverdiging eksklusief verstaan as 'n menslike daad. Sy siening van die daad van geloof alleen maak 'n groot verskil deurdat die goddelose daardeur verbind word met Christus se geregtigheid. Doo-Kim wyk ook af van die Reformatoriese leer van forensiese regverdiging aangesien hy nie daarin slaag om die implikasies van Christus se toegerekende geregtigheid uit te spel nie. Sy leer van die krag van gebed bepaal sy siening van die regverdiging. Sy opvatting van berou word gedra deur sy aksent op geloof-deur-gebed waardeur die *sola fide* soos geleer deur Luther, verander word in 'n menslike prestasie wat die imputasie van Christus se geregtigheid tot gevolg het. Yong-Do Lee verstaan die regverdiging van die goddelose binne die beginsel van ons eenheid met Christus wat as basis dien vir die “dubbele ruil” in sy teologie. Hy sien nie 'n noodsaaklike relasie tussen regverdiging en die soewereine, vrye genade van God nie. Hoewel Sung-Bong Lee in vergelyking met die ander drie, heelwat diepte vind in die toerekening van Christus se geregtigheid, slaag hy nie daarin om duidelik te onderskei tussen regverdiging en heiliging nie. Sy deurslaggewende voorstel ten opsigte van die gelowiges se eenheid met Christus, kan nie vereenselwig word met die Reformatoriese leer van forensiese imputasie nie.

Die gevolgtrekking van hierdie studie is dat, met die uitsondering van Jonathan Edwards, hierdie opwekkingspredikers en teoloë onwillig was om die Reformatoriese leer van die forensiese regverdiging met betrekking tot erfsonde, eenheid met Christus, en die forensiese toerekening van Christus se geregtigheid aan die sondaars, te onderskryf.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I express my thanks and gratitude towards our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for what he has done in my life and what has been accomplished. I also would like to thank my promoter, Dr. P. Flip Theron who played an important role in providing me guidance, offering help and suggestions. He has greatly challenged and encouraged me throughout doctoral studies.

Additionally, I have been blessed with countless suggestions, criticisms, and personal favors by my mentor and co-promoter, Dr. D. Clair Davis (Westminster Theological Seminary), who guided me to the theme of this dissertation. I also thank my internal and external readers, Drs. Dirk Jacobs Smit and SeungGoo Lee, who despite their busy schedules have given me helpful suggestions as they read through the entire work.

My research has required me to consult many works from the United States of America and Korea. I have thus been heavily dependent upon the courtesy and industry of many librarians who provided invaluable research assistance for this study. I am thankful to the library staff at Westminster Theological Seminary, especially Miss Grace Mullen who showed wonderful kindness to help me.

The staff at the following institutions deserve special mention for their assistance: Stellenbosch University, Princeton University, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Chongshin University, Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, and the Archives for Korean Church History Studies.

I am also grateful to the members of the Redeemer Community Church, who offered support and prayer throughout my doctoral studies and continue to sustain me in my life and work. They always helped me to realize that there is more to life than books and academic degrees.

A special word of thanks is due to the late Dr. SoonJick Choe, Dr. JongHyun Chang, and Mr. and Mrs. SoonHyun Hwang, whose prayers and support have been indispensable to my studies at Westminster Theological Seminary, Lutheran Theological Seminary, and my doctoral studies at Stellenbosch University. To Mr. Jim Scott who undertook the editorial work on my final dissertation and Mrs. Sue Smith for reading my manuscript in part and giving me valuable suggestions, I owe my heartfelt thanks. A very special word of appreciation is due to the faculty of Stellenbosch University and Mrs. Wilma Rieckert for their lovingkindness and remarkable willingness to help me in various ways.

I would like to thank my parents, my mother-in-law for her continual prayer, my brothers and sisters, WonJae, HeeJae, Wan, Hyun, my brothers-in-law, and my-sisters-in-law, whose affection and support have sustained me through this and so many important events in my life.

Most of all, I want to express my gratitude and love to EunHee, my spouse and colleague in ministry, for her unfailing support and for her devotion to the Lord. And to our three children, Esther YunJung, Joyce YunSun, and Samuel YunIl, who have contributed greatly to my education. I admire their patience. I hope that this whole effort will contribute something to help them love our Lord Jesus Christ and preserve their faith in God towards a future full of joy in our Lord Jesus Christ as a gift of God.

Sola fide, sola gratia, sola scriptura, solus Christus, and sola Deo Gloria!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II. FROM SOLA GRATIA TO PREPARATIONIST PURITANISM AND AMERICAN REVIVALISM..	16
Sola Gratia.....	17
Preparationist Puritanism.....	19
American Revivalism.....	22
CHAPTER III. THE NECESSITY OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS FOR THE WICKED.....	33
A. The Necessity of the Grace of God.....	33
B. The Justification of the Wicked.....	43
Reformation Theology.....	44
1. Martin Luther (1483-1546).....	44
2. John Calvin (1509-1564).....	49
Post-Reformation Theology: The Rise of Moralism.....	56
C. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Reformation Theology.....	64
Martin Luther (1483-1546).....	64
John Calvin (1509-1564).....	76
D. Conclusion.....	85
CHAPTER IV. THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE GREAT AWAKENING...88	
A. Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758).....	88
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	89
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	110
B. Timothy Dwight (1752-1817).....	135
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	136
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	155
C. Conclusion.....	178
CHAPTER V. THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE KOREAN REVIVALS.....	182
A. The Influence of Calvinistic Revivals on the Korean Revivals.....	182
B. Sun-Ju Kil (1869-1935).....	198
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	198
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	213
C. Ik-Doo Kim (1874-1950).....	232
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	232
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	248
D. Yong-Do Lee (1901-1933).....	266
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	266
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	280

E. Sung-Bong Lee (1900-1965).....	301
1. The Justification of the Wicked.....	301
2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.....	314
F. Conclusion.....	335
CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION.....	341
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	361

The Evangelical Abolitionism of the 19th-century (1994), 13-22.

What role does the Reformation play in the development of modern theological debate? One voice calling for unity in the 1990s was the "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification" (JDDJ) of 1998. Together, "The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium" (1998) and "The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification" (1998) are two of the most important documents of the 1990s.¹ This document (JDDJ) is regarded like a landmark in the history of Christianity. The authors of the document sought to find new ways to bridge the theological differences between evangelicals and Catholics. It also emphasizes the importance of the doctrine of justice, justice, and the doctrine of salvation from Reformation thinking. The document also emphasizes the basic message of Christianity.

Although the signers were well aware of their "differing beliefs," they agreed that unless they issued a statement, the spirit of unity at the "patrimony of Christianity" would soon fade away, having no impact on the "world of the future." They boldly challenged "Evangelical Protestants" with a call to respect, affirm, and proclaim this Gospel and to sustain the continuity of faith, worship, and discipline.

¹ *First Things*, 43 (May, 1994), 13-22.

² *Ibid.*, 4-5, 8.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Reaffirmed Significance of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

What role does the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone play in modern theological debate? One voice calling for *unity* was “Evangelicals and Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium,” a declaration issued on March 29, 1994.¹ This document (ECT I) exploded like a bombshell on American Reformed Christians. The authors of the document sought to find common ground and avoid the theological differences between evangelicals and Catholics. But because it failed to emphasize the importance of the doctrine of *forensic* justification to the gospel, it divorced the doctrine of salvation from Reformation theology, and it fell short of stating the basic message of Christianity.

Although the signers were well aware of their “differing beliefs,” they feared that unless they issued a statement, the spirit of unity or the “pattern of convergence and cooperation” would soon fade away, having no impact on the “civil society.”² Therefore, they boldly challenged “Evangelical Protestants” with a call to *unity*, claiming that “To proclaim this Gospel and to sustain the community of faith, worship, and discipleship that

¹ *First Things*, 43 (May, 1994), 15-22.

² *Ibid.*, 4-5, 8.

is gathered by this Gospel is the first and chief responsibility of the church.”³

Consequently, the theological reflection in this document is left out, being merely the proclamation of the gospel or the call to unity. In many ways, then, ECT I reversed the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith alone, thus falling back into the essential problem of the Reformation age. Just as ECT I as a whole undermined the doctrine of justification by faith alone, so a second document, “The Gift of Salvation” (ECT II), issued in 1998, attempted to achieve “convergence and cooperation” on the doctrine of justification, and again called for unity between evangelicals and Catholics.⁴ Such cosigners as Mark Noll and J. I. Packer defended the document and asserted that they would continue to have conversations on the remaining theological differences:

While we rejoice in the unity..., we recognize that there are necessarily interrelated questions that require further and urgent exploration. Among such questions are

³ Ibid., 4.

⁴ *First Things*, 79 (January, 1998), 20-23. The “new perspective” on Paul in New Testament scholarship also promotes unity between Protestant churches and Catholic churches. N. T. Wright, a representative of this movement, claims that Paul’s doctrine of justification by faith “impels the churches” into “the ecumenical task.” N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 158. In *What Saint Paul Really Said*, Wright interprets Paul’s doctrine of justification in terms of *covenant membership*: “What Paul means by justification, in this context, should therefore be clear. It is not ‘how you become a Christian,’ so much as ‘how you can tell who is a member of the covenant family.’” Ibid., 122. Wright’s reformulation of the doctrine of justification is more about “ecclesiology” than soteriology. Ibid., 118-19. When speaking of the “righteousness” that comes from God in Philippians 3:9, Wright also refers to the “status of covenant membership.” Ibid., 124. This stress on righteousness is important because it rejects the *forensic* imputation of Christ’s alien righteousness to the sinner. For Wright, when Paul speaks of Abraham’s faith being “reckoned as righteous” (Romans 4:5), he means that “faith in Christ is the true badge of covenant membership.” Ibid., 129. Wright wants to show that the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to a sinner; rather, he is declared to be a member of the covenant family by faith. Wright believes that God’s righteousness cannot be transferred to the sinner, since it is “God’s own righteousness,” which is relevant to God’s “own covenant faithfulness.” Ibid., 124. Wright explicitly denies the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. Therefore, justification is not a forensic declaration, but a “covenant declaration.” Ibid., 131. Cf. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 137-56, 203, 214, 236. Wright makes a further point that is especially relevant: Faith in the doctrine of justification is the “badge of covenant membership.” Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 125. Cf. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 2, 171, 194. Thus, Luther’s notion of faith has no place in this system. Wright’s definition of justification is defective in that it denies the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the sinner. He also waters down the grace of God, original sin, the atonement, and the role of faith in comparison with the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification.

these:... the historic uses of the language of *justification* as it relates to *imputed and transformative righteousness*; the normative status of *justification* in relation to all Christian doctrine; the assertion that while *justification is by faith alone*, the faith that receives salvation is never alone; diverse understanding of merit, reward, purgatory, and indulgences; Marian devotion and the assistance of the saints in the life of salvation; and the possibility of salvation for those who have not been evangelized.⁵

One important question about the doctrine of justification by faith alone, especially in relation to the ground of our righteousness, is the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Despite some agreements with Protestant doctrine, ECT II does not present the *forensic* language of imputation, thus downgrading the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone.⁶ Although the ECT documents do not deny the importance of the remaining theological differences, they essentially object to the doctrine of justification as typically set forth in the history of Reformed theology. By signing the ECT documents, many evangelical leaders essentially withdrew from Reformation theology. They retreat from the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. They water down the doctrine of *forensic* justification for the sake of theological compromise, producing great confusion at the core of the gospel.

Can any theological approach to the understanding of the gospel move beyond the doctrine of justification by faith alone? Fortunately, some evangelicals who had signed the ECT documents worked with others in 1999 to produce an attempted solution, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration." Drafted by evangelical scholars such as J. I. Packer, Don Carson, and R. C. Sproul, this document has been endorsed by more than 200 evangelical leaders, including John Stott, Bill Bright, and

⁵ *First Things*, 79: 22 (italics added).

⁶ This is clearly a Catholic victory. In fact, they maintain the central doctrine of justification as set forth by the Council of Trent (6.7), which is the doctrine of justification by sanctification.

Billy Graham.⁷ This document draws our attention because it establishes that justification by faith alone, a key element of the gospel, is disclosed again to the present age and offers hope for the future. It states that the righteousness of Christ is “counted, reckoned, or imputed to us by the forensic (that is, legal) declaration of God, as the sole ground of our justification.”⁸ Clearly, these evangelicals desire to preserve the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith alone, or the Reformed doctrine of imputation. The “Celebration” affirms the seriousness of the idea that the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is the *sole* ground of *forensic* justification.⁹ Its rejection of the idea of inherent righteousness is most clearly expressed in its criticism of the doctrine of the infusion of Christ’s righteousness. In rejecting the idea that the wicked are “justified by the righteousness of Christ infused into us or any righteousness that is thought to inhere within us,” it makes clear that the imputation is a double transfer “both of our sins to Christ and of his righteousness to us.”¹⁰ Ultimately, the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the wicked, while attacked by the ECT documents, serves the life of the church and upholds God’s sovereign grace in salvation.

⁷ This document was endorsed by both ECT supporters such as J. I. Packer and ECT critics such as R. C. Sproul. It is more of “Evangelicals and Evangelicals Together” than “Evangelicals and Catholics Together.”

⁸ Quoted from “The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration,” available at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2000/106/54.0.html>, 5. It speaks of justification not only as imputation, but also as a forensic declaration of God.

⁹ It stresses the doctrine of justification “by his grace alone, and through faith alone, because of Christ alone.” It can be read at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2000/106/54.0.html>, 5-6.

Methodological Considerations

This dissertation will examine the doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in the Great Awakening of eighteenth-century America and the twentieth-century Korean revivals, viewed through the teachings of six key revivalists. As we have just seen, this topic plays an important role in current theological discussions. These recent controversies are related to many crucial questions pertaining to imputation and have stirred up substantial disputes among American Reformed people. Understanding the role of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in the six revivalists will help us to understand better the teaching of justification by faith alone in Reformed circles today.

The present dissertation examines the views of two American and four Korean revivalists on imputation and their consistency with historic Reformation teaching. Although some of them use the language of Reformation theology, their views on imputation must be explored in relation to the doctrine of justification. Basically, we will focus on the doctrine of *forensic* imputation. The teachings of the six revivalists on a number of related theological issues may be called into question, but it is not our intention to examine all the theological issues raised by the views of the six revivalists. The key question of the dissertation is whether they hold to the Reformation doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in relation to justification by faith alone.

However, the theological issues of imputation cannot be examined without certain theological themes. As we examine the views of the six revivalists, it is necessary: (1) to examine their views on *the justification of the wicked* in relation to the Reformation

¹⁰ Available online at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2000/106/54.0.html>, 5.

doctrine of *forensic* justification,¹¹ and (2) to discuss *the imputation of Christ's righteousness*.¹²

The first problem facing the six revivalists is the question of the status of humanity and the necessity of Christ's righteousness for *forensic* justification. Thus, we will examine what the six revivalists consider to be the status of human beings in relation to the divine Judge. In soteriology, human ability has always been inseparable from the question of salvation. Thus, before the six revivalists discuss the nature of justification, they first have to set forth how justification is even possible, in light of the sinful nature of humanity. Building on their views of the necessity of salvation, we will see that to deny original sin is to assert the power of the human will. We will find a close relationship between original sin and divine grace in justification. We may begin to question whether they believe that divine grace can be the sole source of justification.

¹¹ The denial of God's grace is rooted in an inaccurate definition of original sin, which then leads to a priori exclusion of *iustitia Dei* (divine justice) and the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in any theologians, for they do not see sin as a judicial problem. If one fails to see a *forensic* element in sin, he will affirm that we have no need of God's grace from the beginning in justification and that justification in any sense can be a moral transformation or inner renewal of the ungodly sinner. Therefore, in this section, *the justification of the wicked*, we will deal with original sin, God's grace, free will, faith, and the necessity of Christ's righteousness in relation to *forensic* justification before we proceed to examine their doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

¹² For the second section, *the imputation of Christ's righteousness*, we will deal with *forensic* justification, election, legal union, and the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness. Generally, it can be said that the doctrine of justification through *forensic* imputation cannot be separately examined from these related themes in these two sections that will be dealt with in this dissertation. However, what is important in this dissertation is to examine their assumptions about these theological themes in relation to *forensic* imputation. Certainly, there is a problem here, especially to deal with the four Korean revivalists. At bottom, the difficulty is that there is no real consensus on the nature and meaning of imputation in them, since we do not have abundant original materials of their works available to us. This dissertation will not try to completely resolve that issue—indeed, it is questionable whether it can be resolved. However, there are understandings of imputation that can embrace their theologies through the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness with their doctrines of *forensic* justification, election, legal union, and the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness. We will see that the denial of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness results from an omission of *forensic* element of the imputation of Adam's sin, which then results in a denial of *forensic* justification. Therefore, two subdivisions are necessary for the analysis of their doctrine of *forensic* imputation in this dissertation: that is, (1) *the justification of the wicked*, and (2) *the imputation of Christ's righteousness*.

That is to say, a person who articulates a doctrine of original sin that is consistently ambiguous will redefine the relationship of faith and works in a way somewhat different from Reformation theology. To reject the doctrine of original sin leaves no alternative except salvation obtained by the power of the will, which denies *sola gratia* in justification. We shall see also that their basic arguments for justification depend on the nature of faith. What is the relationship between human ability and faith? The definition of faith is critical for the doctrine of justification, for in the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith alone, faith is sharply distinguished from human works. To emphasize the power of the will in salvation leaves no room for the Reformation themes of *sola fide* and *sola gratia* in the doctrine of justification.

Next, before examining the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, we must discuss the *forensic* relationship between Adam and his posterity. It cannot be overlooked that Scripture speaks regularly about Adam acting representatively, so that the first sin of Adam is attributed to the whole human race. Doubtless, some revivalists, in their denial of Adam's legal union with his posterity, will deny the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin to them. But when we look at Adam's relationship with his posterity, we tend to see Adam's sin and human depravity. Thus, to understand the need for Christ's righteousness, it is necessary to recognize the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. A person who fails to be precise about the *forensic* relationship between Adam's sin and his posterity cannot give a precise account of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness either. We will see that the understanding of what happens after the Fall precedes the necessity of Christ's vicarious atonement to satisfy *iustitia Dei* (divine justice). In other words, no one can clearly state the role of the divine

will in justification without understanding the sinful condition of human beings. If one sees Adam's legal union with his posterity in original sin, one can see the *forensic* relationship between Christ, as the federal Head, and his people.

Finally, we should try to elucidate the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked in the teachings of the six revivalists. Some of them simply teach human depravity. But we will see that they need to speak of the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin; it is not enough to speak of sinful human nature without connecting sinners to Adam. When we examine their terms, we will see that instead of terms based on "imputation" or "union," some of their choices of terms are inadequate to explain the *forensic* relationships between Adam and his posterity and between Christ and his people. We will see that such terms cause some confusion.

The Purpose of This Study

As we have seen in the ECT documents, it is difficult to find unity between evangelicals and Roman Catholics when theological differences between them so clearly exist. More specifically, the ECT documents are also unclear or ambiguous about the relationship of their doctrine of justification to Reformation theology. Since justification is one of the most important themes in theology, attention has already been paid to the recent ECT documents. They show us the significance of the doctrines of justification and imputation. As we analyze the topic in this way, it seems that we are learning about the essence of the gospel. When we examine these documents, we learn that questions about the nature of saving faith and its relationship to imputation ought not to be defined by what Reformation theology opposed. We have seen that many theologians can be

influenced by a concern to avoid going in the wrong directions in the name of unity. As we examine the teachings of the six revivalists, we will seek again to define the important relationship between *forensic* justification and the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness.

This study will examine the role of the doctrine of justification in both the Great Awakening and the Korean Revivals through the six revivalists. In particular, we will examine the positions of the American and the Korean preachers on the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. The texts we deal with in this dissertation are mostly the sermons or works of the six revivalists: Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Yong-Do Lee, and Sung-Bong Lee. Are they really trying to defend the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone? Or are they attempting to rewrite the doctrine? Do their teachings contribute to the doctrine of imputation?

The most prominent American theologian of the eighteenth century was Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758). He taught the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith alone, so that it played a significant role in the First Great Awakening. He also emphasized the importance of personal experience in conversion. In revivalism, Edwards was an articulate defender of the Reformation doctrine of divine sovereignty in connection with the doctrine of justification. His emphasis on the monergistic work of God in regeneration reflected a concern that lay at the heart of the First Great Awakening. Edwards devoted himself to the defense of the Reformed doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness.

Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), a grandson of Edwards, was concerned with New

England theology, which represented a departure from strict Reformation theology. In his understanding, the revivalism of the Second Great Awakening came from human effort. Because of this emphasis on the power of the will, Dwight turned away from the doctrine of limited atonement and asserted his distinctive doctrine of general atonement.¹³ More important, although he rejected Arminian theology, Dwight did not go so far as to adhere to the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

After considering how the two American revivalists explained the doctrine of justification, we will look at four Korean revivalists: (1) Sun-Ju Kil (a Presbyterian pastor, 1869-1935), (2) Ik-Doo Kim (a Presbyterian pastor, 1874-1950), (3) Yong-Do Lee (a Methodist pastor, 1901-1933), and (4) Sung-Bong Lee (a Holiness church pastor, 1900-1965). Sun-Ju Kil was the greatest preacher and evangelist in Korean church history. Due to his preaching and teaching, the great revival of 1907 had a significant impact on the Korean church. He emphasized the mercy and grace of God in his evangelistic preaching, and his sermons focused on the redemptive work of God. He recognized humanity's overwhelming need for the love of God because of human depravity. However, the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith through Christ alone was not explicit in his theology.

Ik-Doo Kim affirmed the love of God, the cross of Christ, the precious blood of Christ, repentance, and the coming kingdom of God in his sermons. His emphasis on repentance and humility led people to overcome their sinful nature and the power of the

¹³ In this dissertation, the notion of limited atonement is not used in relation to the idea of *numerus clausus* (closed number of the elect). Major concern here is whether a person supports the idea of *sola gratia* or human meritorious work in justification whenever he uses a word *limited* or *general*. Thus, in this dissertation the limited atonement is closely related to the issue of *sola gratia* in justification, not the scope of the elect. We will discuss it further in the next chapter.

world. Even though he weakened the grace of God in salvation, he seemed to relate the doctrine of original sin to the world. Providing hope in a powerful way, Ik-Doo Kim's unique healing ministry was renowned in Korea, and his revival movement contributed greatly to the growth of the Korean church. However, Kim's view of the imputed righteousness of Christ was ambiguous.

For Yong-Do Lee, the spiritual power of the Holy Spirit was a fundamental source of the Christian life. In spite of his emphasis on mystical union with Christ, it seems that Lee's total neglect of the imputed righteousness of Christ made his doctrine a form of mysticism. For Lee, human relationship with God is rooted in a radical fellowship with Christ. This fellowship climaxes in the mystical union with Christ, which gives a believer victory over the flesh. However, his emphasis on this union with Christ completely rules out the imputed righteousness of Christ to the wicked.

The theology of Sung-Bong Lee emphasizes evangelism in relation to revivals, stressing repentance, holiness, healing, and the second coming of Christ as major themes. To some extent, Lee's theology seems to follow the traditional doctrine of imputed righteousness. He understands that Christ became one's "righteousness" in regeneration. At the center of Lee's doctrine of righteousness, unlike that of his predecessors, is his understanding of the nature of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Unfortunately, however, he failed to connect legal union with Christ with justification. His emphasis on repentance made his doctrine of salvation synergistic, giving man the ability to take the initiative for his salvation.

We will see that Jonathan Edwards followed the traditional Reformed doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness. We will also see that Timothy Dwight

followed neither the Reformation tradition nor the teaching of Jonathan Edwards. Finally, we will see that most of the four Korean preachers, being influenced by the theology of the American missionaries, did not follow the Reformation doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

In this first chapter, we have discussed methodological considerations and the purpose of the dissertation, and established the importance of this study.

In the second chapter, From *Sola gratia* to Preparationist Puritanism and American Revivalism, the notion of revivals will be briefly examined in light of the gospel. What is true revival? Can we prepare revivals with prayer? Do we need the gospel for revivals today? The answers to these questions depend very much on one's understanding of the meaning of revival. To determine what true revival is, we will briefly examine the views of revival in Christian history. In this chapter, the relationship between revivals and the sovereignty of God will be discussed.

In the third chapter, we will examine the necessity for Christ's righteousness to be imputed to the wicked. We will discuss the historical background of the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification in order to establish a proper understanding of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone in the sixteenth century became one of the most significant teachings in Christian history. Luther disputed the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, especially regarding the question of how a wicked man can become right with God. We will show how the Reformers, including Calvin, sought to elucidate the *forensic* doctrines of justification and imputation. For this purpose, we will discuss (1) the necessity of God's grace, (2) the justification of the wicked and (3) the imputation of Christ's righteousness

in Reformation theology. In this way, we will seek to present the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification by faith alone.

We will discuss the imputation of Christ's righteousness in the Great Awakening in the fourth chapter. That is, we will see how the two great figures in the Great Awakening—Jonathan Edwards and Timothy Dwight—understood the human relationship with God in justification and imputation. When discussing the doctrine of justification, Jonathan Edwards focused on the active obedience of Christ. Edwards's treatments of *forensic* justification stress the sovereign grace of God in regeneration. For him, meritorious works cannot earn salvation. This reinforces Edwards's emphasis on the federal headship of Adam and Christ. He emphasizes the monergistic grace of God in justification, maintaining the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity and the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to his people. But Timothy Dwight, his grandson, denied the *forensic* relationship between the first sin of Adam and the sinful nature of humanity. Dwight's position on justification is different in significant ways from Edwards's position. For one thing, human depravity is only partial—not a Calvinistic teaching. They disagreed also on the distinction between the relationships between Adam and his posterity and Christ and his people.

Lastly, in the fifth chapter we will discuss the doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness in the Korean revivals. We will first deal with the influence of Calvinistic revivalism on the Korean revivals before discussing the teachings of the four famous Korean revivalist preachers: Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Yong-Do Lee, and Sung-Bong Lee. We will briefly trace the theological roots of the early Korean churches, which will give us insight into their sermons. We should keep in mind here that American

missionaries laid the theological foundation for the early Korean churches. We will see that the policy of the two major American missionary groups—the Presbyterians and the Methodists—to avoid theological debates established a tendency to minimize theological differences, which led to Arminian revivalism among the Korean churches. After discussing the influence of Calvinistic revivalism, we will explore the teachings of Sun-Ju Kil, a Presbyterian pastor. Although he maintained human inability in the Reformation tradition, he was driven to emphasize the power of the human will and the dispensational eschatology in the kingdom of God. We will see that he disagreed with the Reformation teachings regarding original sin, *forensic* justification, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Ik-Doo Kim, another Presbyterian revivalist, was a strong defender of the infallibility of the Bible, but stood firmly in the tradition of Arminian revivalism. Kim's view failed to emphasize the implications of Christ's imputed righteousness. His revival movement was called a "prayer movement." In Kim's teachings, the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification is not explicit. The distinctive teachings of Yong-Do Lee contrast strikingly with those of Sun-Ju Kil and Ik-Doo Kim. A strong dualism was basic to his theology. He had a distinctive view of *oneness* with Christ, by which the mind receives the Holy Spirit to obtain life. However, we will see that this special grace of God has nothing to do with *forensic* justification by faith alone, nor with the *forensic* imputation of the righteousness of Christ. The last Korean revivalist, Sung-Bong Lee, spoke of Christ's righteousness in order to stress God's grace, but his teachings never led to a profound and clear teaching of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Essentially, Lee appealed to the power of the will in salvation. He did not see a necessary relationship between justification and

the free grace of the sovereign God. According to Lee, the foundation for justification lies in human repentance, rather than the divine will. On the basis of his doctrine of the will, Lee also denied the Reformation doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Throughout this study, we will consider whether we can reaffirm the significance of the *forensic* doctrine of *justification by faith alone* as we examine the sermons or works of the six revivalists. If we can, we also want to discuss its relationship to the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Sola Gratia

The gospel of the Reformation turns the Christian away from the power of the human will to look for *sola gratia* and the “actual influence” of the Holy Spirit.² What then is the *actual influence* in revivals? Does human decision play a significant role in revivals? Can we prepare ourselves for revivals? The answers to these questions depend very much on one’s understanding of the place of the sovereignty of God in salvation. Rome’s interpretation of salvation in the sixteenth century formulated a doctrine of justification by works, unlike the Reformers.

This raises an important question that is part of the discussion in this chapter, that is, “How does true revival occur?” The various views on revival can be summarized in two ways: (1) one view emphasizes the sovereign act of God in revivals, and (2) the other view emphasizes human responsibility as a particular condition for revival.³ The former can be called the Calvinistic view of revivalism and the latter the Arminian view. When discussing the views of revival, it is not appropriate for John Armstrong to argue that Luther makes “revival the norm, not something *extraordinary*,” maintaining that Luther

² The phrase “actual influence” comes from Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 16, Article 3. Cf. A. A. Hodge, *The Confession of Faith* (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1992), 223. Iain Murray points out that this notion of the actual influence of the Holy Spirit by the Westminster divines emphasizes the absolute sovereignty of God in salvation. Iain Murray, *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism, 1750-1858* (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1994), 19. At this point, it also indicates that WCF sees salvation as the work of the Holy Spirit. A. A. Hodge, *Confession*, 202.

³ The former view sees revivals as the sovereign works of God *sola gratia*, and the latter see them as the fruits of human efforts. John Armstrong introduces two historic views of revival: (1) the blessing of revivals is determined by *specific conditions* such as “prayer and evangelism,” and (2) the revivals are “the sovereign gift of grace.” John H. Armstrong, *Preparing for True Revival When God Moves* (Eugene: Harvest House Publishers, 1998), 37-48. Iain Murray offers one more view, according to Armstrong: the need of the influence of the Holy Spirit already exists within us. Armstrong, 48-49; Murray, *Revival*.

tends to stress the power of the human will in repentance.⁴ Is it really true that Luther does not see revivals as *extraordinary* works of God? Indeed, Luther is precisely interested in the proclamation of the law and the gospel in relation to repentance. However, it is important to note that when Luther discusses repentance in connection with the law, he neither stresses repentance as a necessary condition in regeneration, nor sees revival as *the norm*, as Armstrong claims.⁵ Rather, Luther's doctrine of repentance calls us to look to Christ.⁶ Luther gives the glory to God *sola gratia* in his soteriology. Thus, there is no particular reason to believe that there are elements in his theology that describe revival as the norm. Therefore, it is somewhat misleading to call Luther an advocate of revivalism, like Charles Finney, in view of the history of the concept.⁷

However, one would say that the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century stressed the importance of human responsibility in revivals and may certainly in one sense be called preparationist, since she believed that one must cooperate with and assent to the indwelling grace (*cooperare et assentare*).⁸ Thus, a sinner can prepare for regeneration in Roman Catholic theology. As for the actual influence of the Holy Spirit, Calvin claims that God may prepare the heart of the wicked, yet he denies the possibility

⁴ Armstrong, 48-49. As for this argument, it is not proper for Armstrong to cite the notion of repentance in Luther's Ninety-five Theses (the first thesis).

⁵ G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 25-26, 179-81.

⁶ Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 258-66. Althaus also shows that Luther emphasizes the importance of the "lifelong repentance" of Christians in connection with Christ. *Ibid.*, 269. At this point, I believe that Luther's notion of lifelong repentance must be understood by his phrase *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously just and a sinner).

⁷ Armstrong, 49.

⁸ Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 13. We will discuss Rome's doctrine of justification in the next chapter.

of preparatory repentance in conversion: “The Lord by his Spirit directs, bends, and governs, our heart and reigns in it.”⁹ Clearly, then, Calvin deals with the concept of preparation, distinguishing his own view from the views of the Roman Catholic Church and the Scholastics.¹⁰ Calvin undertakes this task, but in this respect he is not different from Luther with the notion of *sola gratia*.¹¹ Calvin’s point here is that, in assuming human inability, salvation cannot be earned by man’s preparatory work. According to Calvin, the law plays a role because it “points” the way to the grace of God in salvation.¹² Calvin is not a preparationist.

Preparationist Puritanism

Is there any possibility that the preparation of the wicked is meritorious, guaranteeing them the grace of God in salvation? Some Puritan divines argue that the wicked can take some steps in preparation for conversion, for they emphasize “religious experience and practical piety.”¹³ In Puritan theology, “preparatory activity must be

⁹ John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 2.3.10.

¹⁰ The theology of the Scholastics will be briefly discussed in the next chapter.

¹¹ Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 41. Pettit appears to be an advocate of preparationism in this book.

¹² Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.5.7. For example, Calvin seeks to show that “the power” to obey the law “comes from God’s goodness.” At this point, the “whole virtue” of human beings must come from “the help of divine grace.” In this sense, he uses the phrase “ill-prepared” to designate human self-preparation for salvation. *Ibid.*

¹³ I. Breward, “Puritan Theology,” in *New Dictionary of Theology*; Pettit, 3-11.

examined in terms of the Law and the Gospel.”¹⁴ For example, William Perkins (1558-1602) seeks to elucidate a voluntary act of the will in relation to covenant theology:

From Perkins, as well as from Hildersam, others learned the rudiments of covenant theology, adding their own emphasis on voluntarism.... Although faith comes from God, man might “beg” for grace as well; he might turn his mind from the eternal decrees toward genuine responsibilities in the inner self—responsibilities on which a fully developed concept of preparation would soon be built.¹⁵

The formulation of preparationist Puritanism is that the wicked “can respond” to the law “in a gradual way,” although they have no ability to “choose” Jesus Christ with the power of their will.¹⁶ By preparation, these Puritans mean “a period of prolonged introspective meditation” and self-examination with respect to “God’s revealed Word.”¹⁷ They understand that this preparation is the work of the Holy Spirit, possibly opening the door to some form of ability on the part of the wicked to believe in Jesus Christ.¹⁸

The question arises: What do the wicked need to do before they come to believe in Jesus Christ? At this point, William Shedd, advocating preparationist Puritanism, answers: (1) “reading and hearing” the word of God, (2) “serious application of the mind,

¹⁴ Pettit, 15.

¹⁵ Ibid., 14.

¹⁶ Ibid., 17.

¹⁷ Ibid., 17. With these steps in the process of salvation, the wicked first examine “the evils of sins, repent for those sins,” and then turn “to God for salvation.” Ibid. Pettit also points out that although William Perkins is more close to “Calvin’s idea of forceful constraint,” he typically teaches that a sinner “begins to prepare himself for saving grace with the help of the Spirit.” Ibid., 64, 61-65. Cf. Heinrich Heppel, *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 524-25.

¹⁸ In this respect, it is our obligation to wait for the work of the Holy Spirit in salvation. This form of preparationism is not acceptable to Luther and Calvin. Thus, it must be understood that conversion does not consist of any virtue of waiting for the work of the Holy Spirit. It would certainly be wrong to admit steps or stages in the process of salvation, like these preparationists, for one fundamentally falls into a synergistic view of justification. Therefore, one may believe easily and falsely with this notion of preparationism that the steps in the process of salvation may supply a legitimate ground for salvation.

and the examination of the truth in order to understand and feel its force,” and (3) “prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit both as a convicting and a regenerating spirit, which is commanded by Christ in Luke 11:19.”¹⁹ For a preparationist, like Shedd, *cooperatio* (cooperation) with the Holy Spirit in salvation turns out to be the “command” of God.²⁰ Shedd’s point is crucial to the understanding of preparationism: in his synergistic view, one cannot speak of conversion without recognizing some kind of capacity for the reception of the gospel call in salvation. On the contrary, regeneration in Reformed theology is basically the “immediate” monergistic work of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, by which the Spirit “*operates directly on the will of man*, and not through the mediation of the intellect.”²¹

Arminians, however, going in a different direction on the doctrine of human cooperation with divine grace in regeneration, come up with a new form of justification by works, a synergism that God’s new covenant in the gospel is “essentially a conditional promise, based on Christ’s death.”²² This Arminian formulation of a synergistic doctrine of justification, with which they condemn the Reformed doctrine of *unconditional*

¹⁹ William Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, vol. II (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1888), 512-13. With this view of preparationism, Shedd has gone too far, even more than those Puritans.

²⁰ Shedd, 515. In this sense, James Oliver Buswell would agree with Shedd, for he insists that “the convicting work of the Holy Spirit in the world in general, is a work upon the hearts of all men prior to either faith or regeneration, a work wherein not only is the Gospel freely offered to all, but *all are brought to a point of enablement* to such a degree that, if having been convicted, they reject the grace of God thus offered to them, they are subject to the eternal wrath and curse of God (italics added).” James Oliver Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), Part II, 157.

²¹ Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), 474.

²² J. I. Packer, “Justification in Protestant Theology,” in *Here We Stand: Justification by Faith Today* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1986), 100-101.

election, is attacked by the Canons of Dort.²³ The Canons of Dort maintain the Calvinistic notion of human inability to choose Jesus Christ in salvation, and reject the Arminian arguments that affirm “conditional election on the basis of foreseen faith, universal atonement, and man’s ability to resist the Holy Spirit.”²⁴ One can see that it is impossible for the Arminians to speak of the imputed righteousness of Christ, which lays the ground of repentance, as A. A. Hodge states, insisting that “true repentance includes faith, and faith unites to Christ and secures the imputation of his righteousness, and the righteousness of Christ of course cancels all possible sin.”²⁵ Hodge describes the notion of repentance in the WCF as a *gracious gift* of God: “That internal repentance, when genuine, is itself a gracious gift of God, without merit in itself; and of value only because it springs from the application of Christ’s grace to the soul, and leads to the application by the soul to Christ’s grace.”²⁶ Why does the WCF affirm that repentance is necessary while it declares that faith is the only instrument of justification? The Westminster divines emphasize the necessity of repentance because it is a necessary evidence of saving faith in Christ.

²³ Pettit, 125-28; Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 28.

²⁴ Pettit, 125-26.

²⁵ Throughout this discussion, Hodge is reflecting on the nature of repentance, which is shown in the WCF: “Although repentance be not to be rested in, as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of God’s free grace in Christ; yet is it of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it” (XV:III). Cf. A. A. Hodge, *Confession*, 213.

²⁶ Hodge, 215. At this point, it is necessary to note the concept of saving faith in the WCF: “The principle acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace” (XIV:II). *Ibid.*, 204.

American Revivalism

In the late 1650s, the issue of church membership was raised in connection with the issue of preparation and merit by a new generation in America. To understand the issue of preparation better, the “Halfway Covenant” needs to be explored. This was the problem of parents who wanted their children to be baptized, even though they themselves were not professing believers. Under the notion of the Halfway Covenant, these parents were allowed to have their children baptized, although they were baptized members only. Solomon Stoddard (1643-1729) of Northampton, for example, developed the idea of the Halfway Covenant by admitting “professing Christians to take communion” and to have “full membership” without “evidence of grace.”²⁷ These professing Christians were allowed to have “communion not as a sign of their having achieved grace but as preparation for grace.”²⁸ This is, in a certain sense, similar to the problem of preparationist Puritanism in connection with the grace of God for salvation. Ultimately, these *professing* Christians were *waiting* for the sovereign grace of God in salvation.

Since there was apparent contradiction in the basic nature of God’s sovereign grace in Reformed theology and in the idea of preparationist Puritanism for salvation, Jonathan Edwards dealt with the issue of qualification for “communicant membership” in 1749:²⁹

²⁷ Pettit, 201; Gerald R. Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason: 1648-1789* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960), 177.

²⁸ Pettit, 201. Pettit points out that Stoddard’s new practice was opposed by those who wanted to keep “the original standards of the Halfway Covenant.” However, his practice spread widely in western Massachusetts. *Ibid.*, 201, 202-207.

My honoured grandfather Stoddard, my predecessor in the ministry over this church, strenuously maintained the Lord's Supper to be a *converting ordinance*, and urged all to come who were not of scandalous life, though they knew themselves to be unconverted. I formerly conformed to his practice but I have had difficulties with respect to it, which have been long increasing, till I dared no longer to proceed in the former way, which has occasioned great uneasiness among my people, and has filled all the country with noise.³⁰

For Edwards, unconditional election takes precedence over preparatory works in salvation. When he raises the twelve "signs" of genuine saving faith in his book, *Religious Affections*, his overall attitude toward the signs is not about preparatory works.³¹ Edwards sees *conversion* as "one of many signs" of unconditional election, while the defenders of preparationist Puritanism regard conversion as the "beginning of hope, as the start of a process leading toward possible assurance of election."³² It is crucial to understand that Edwards does not hesitate to discard the notion of "gradual assurance or conversion through efficacious stages."³³ Thus, in Edwards's view of regeneration, there are no beginning steps and ending steps in the preparatory works of men, since the works of the Holy Spirit as the unconditional sovereign grace of God precede human preparatory works in justification. At any rate, it is plain that in this view

²⁹ By 1744, Edwards became convinced that his grandfather was wrong in this matter. Pettit, 208; George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 345-56.

³⁰ Iain H. Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), 318 (italics not added). As a result of the controversy, Edwards finally had to leave the church in July 1750. Ibid., 319-29.

³¹ Jonathan Edwards shows the twelve signs of a true believer in his book *Religious Affections* to be: (1) spiritual and supernatural influences, (2) Christian love, (3) the loveliness of the moral excellency of divine things, (4) spiritual understanding of divine things, (5) conviction of the truth of the greater things of the gospel, (6) evangelical humiliation, (7) change of the nature of the self, (8) Christlike character, (9) Christian tenderness of spirit, (10) genuine piety, (11) gracious affections, and (12) Christian practice. Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).

³² Pettit, 210.

³³ Ibid., 211-12.

of preparation for conversion, Edwards's view differs from the preparationist Puritanism.³⁴

Edwards would not hesitate to draw the same conclusion even with regard to the notion of revival, if the sovereign grace of God in the gospel is nullified by the preparatory efforts of the human will. For Edwards, unconditional election is not based on human merits, but on the sovereign grace of God. In his soteriology, Edwards seeks to describe concretely how the Arminian notion of divine foreknowledge is false: "God knows the future voluntary actions of men in such a sense beforehand, as that he is able particularly to declare, and foretell them, and write them, or cause them to be written down in a Book."³⁵ In this connection, Edwards is convinced that the Arminian view of resistible grace is wrong.³⁶ By supporting the "Calvinistic doctrine of efficacious grace," Edwards asserts that the "grace of God in a sinner's conversion" is *efficacious* and *irresistible*.³⁷ By reflecting on the *actual influence* of the Holy Spirit in the WCF,

³⁴ Cf. Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification from 1500 to the Present Day* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 119-21; C.F. Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1966), 1-5, 154-64. Probably Edwards's departure from the Anglican divines like Richard Hooker and the English Puritan divines like Richard Baxter can be explained by the notion of Edwards's revivalism. It is evident that Edwards denounced preparationism not only in salvation but also in revivalism.

³⁵ Jonathan Edwards, *Freedom of the Will* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 267. Perhaps Edwards has the *voluntarism* of Puritan divines in his mind, although he differs from them in preparationism, for he often discusses the voluntary act of the will in this book.

³⁶ Herman Bavinck, *The Doctrine of God*, trans. William Hendriksen (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1997), 366-67. Bavinck rightly points out that the Arminian doctrine of God's foreknowledge is based on the *three universalities*: (1) "God's will desiring the salvation of *all*," (2) "Christ's death for *all*," and (3) "the offer of the means sufficient unto salvation to *all*," in making human beings "the absolute Arbiter" of their own salvation. *Ibid.*, 366. Instead of presupposing God's sovereign grace as the ultimate ground of salvation, Arminians presuppose that man has the absolute ability, with which he *can resist* or *not resist* God's grace in salvation. In this sense, God's grace is always *resistible* in Arminianism. At the Council of Trent in 1563, the Roman Catholic Church also opposed the doctrine of irresistible grace in Reformation theology. *Ibid.*, 349-52.

³⁷ Edwards, *Freedom*, 269, 433-35.

Edwards in *Religious Affection* excludes all autonomous human notions, and describes how the Holy Spirit operates in the hearts of the wicked:

And it is true, that for any to expect to receive the saving influences of the Spirit of God, while they neglect a diligent improvement of the appointed means of grace, is unreasonable presumption. And the expectation that the Spirit of God will savingly operate upon their minds, without the Spirit's making use of means, as subservient to the effect, is enthusiastical.³⁸

An important question, however, emerges at this point. If the unregenerate man does not have the ability to earn God's grace in salvation, how can "true revivals" take place? To the question, "What is true revival?" Jonathan Edwards answers that revivals are the "surprising" works of God. He basically considered revivals to be given *sola gratia*. It is essential to understand that Edwards's Calvinistic revivalism are rooted in the works of God, because for Edwards the works of the Holy Spirit bring revivals. Revivals are often described as the "outpouring of the Holy Spirit" in Edwards:

[God's] Spirit shall be gloriously poured out for the wonderful revival and propagation of religion. This great work shall be accomplished, not by the authority of princes, nor by the wisdom of learned men, but by God's Holy Spirit, Zech. 4:6-7, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."... This pouring out of the Spirit of God, when it begins, shall soon bring great multitudes to forsake that vice and profaneness that now so abundantly prevails, and shall cause that vital religion that is now so despised and laughed at in the world to revive.³⁹

To Edwards, the First Great Awakening of the 1740s was the sovereign work of God, by which God converted sinners through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁰ Iain

³⁸ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 138. Edwards also calls a saving influence of the Spirit in regeneration "a saving grace." Ibid.

³⁹ Jonathan Edwards, *A History of the Work of Redemption* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 460. See also Marsden, *Edwards*, 229-38. For the conversion of Gentiles, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit is accompanied by the preaching of disciples in Edwards's explanation. Edwards, *History*, 379-80.

⁴⁰ Iain Murray rightly elucidates the cause of the Great Awakening in the New England as he insists that God is the Author of the Great Awakening:

Murray correctly concluded that the Great Awakening was wrought by the free grace of God. Revivals were the sole works of God. "Revivals are not brought about by the fulfillment of 'conditions' any more than the conversion of a single individual is secured by any series of human actions."⁴¹ It is important to understand that Edwards excludes all human preparatory work in his theology of revivalism, for revivals are considered to be the "unexpected" and "surprising" works of God. Edwards explains that revivals are by the "glorious triumph of free and sovereign grace."⁴²

The work has been very glorious and wonderful in many circumstances and events of it, that has been extraordinary, wherein God has in an uncommon manner made his hand visible, and his power conspicuous; as in the extraordinary degrees of awakening, the *suddenness* of conversions in innumerable instances, in whom though the work was quick, yet the thing wrought is manifestly durable.⁴³

In Edwards's observation, sudden conversions through revivals were brought by God's "own peculiar and immediate work."⁴⁴ Indeed, revivals were brought about by the *absolute sovereignty of God*, not by human preparation.⁴⁵ Edwards recognized in his Calvinistic revivalism that God's will prevails in redemption. And, as Edwards maintains,

Such is man's state in sin that he cannot be saved without the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit. Regeneration, and the faith that results from it, are the gifts of God. Therefore, wherever conversions are multiplied, the cause is to be found not in men, nor in favorable conditions, but in the abundant influences of the Spirit of God that alone make the testimony of the church effective. No other explanation of revival is in harmony with the truths that 'the essence of the Christian scheme—the utter depravity of man, the sovereignly-free grace of Jehovah, the divinity of Christ, the atonement in his blood, regeneration and sanctification of the Holy Spirit. Murray, *Revival*, 21-22.

⁴¹ Ibid., 22.

⁴² Jonathan Edwards, *Great Awakening* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 19, 344-45; Murray, *Edwards*, 115-33.

⁴³ Edwards, *Great*, 346 (*italic added*). For Edwards, the Great Awakening was the work of God's free grace. It was God's extraordinary work. Edwards also related the fruits of revival in his *Great Awakening*. Ibid., 117, 210, 220-21, 260-61, 326-31.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 209-10.

⁴⁵ Murray, *Revival*, 20-23; Keith J. Hardman, *Seasons of Refreshing: Evangelism and Revivals in American* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1944), 67-68.

for revivalist theology one should follow Calvinism, rather than Arminianism. The Great Awakening of the 1740s drew people's attention to the "holiness of God" and sinful human nature, which revitalized Calvinistic theology in America. Revivalism in the 1740s, nevertheless, laid the foundation of American evangelicalism by opening the way for a new phase, for it was inclined to emphasize that *personal experience* is central to the Christian life.⁴⁶

The most important consequence of the Great Revival for the Presbyterians was the new ethos which came to prevail in the churches. Old Side prejudices lost their hold and a 'unanimity of sentiment' came to distinguish the denomination in the South. The main cause for this was undoubtedly *the priority now given to experimental religion*. Prayer was restored to its rightful place and 'fervent charity' came to be expected among all Christians.⁴⁷

One thing we know about Jonathan Edwards, as we have seen before, is that he wished to praise God's sovereign grace in revivals. Edwards emphasized Calvinistic theology, but it does not appear to be successful as a great critique of *experimental religion*.⁴⁸ However, it

⁴⁶ Iain Murray points out that the revivalism of 1740s eventually separated the Presbyterians (Old Siders) from other denominations. He also says that due to revivalism the Old Siders criticized the preaching of George Whitefield. Murray, *Revival*, 92-93. Old Siders believed that this kind of revivalism was a "threat to Presbyterian order and theology." D. G. Hart and John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995), 20. Hart and Muether see the revivalism of 1740s led by Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield as a breaking point that weakened the authority of God's "word, sacrament, and the communal membership" in church. At this point, Hart and Muether believe that the first Great Awakening had a negative influence in the Reformed circles, although revivals won many souls with the gospel. *Ibid.*, 20-21. It seems to me that, in general, they are willing to eliminate any attempt to achieve God's grace by human effort. Perhaps such analysis comes from their belief that it is not possible to predict just how revivals will take place.

⁴⁷ Murray, *Revival*, 105-106 (italics added). Murray believes that revivals also change the notion of church membership: "It was no longer assumed that those who attended church from birth were Christians, nor was 'profession of faith' henceforth taken as sufficient evidence of conversion." Thus, churches became more careful when they examined candidates for communicant membership. *Ibid.*, 106.

⁴⁸ Hart and Muether think that the revivalism of Edwards and Whitefield was starting to show subtle change in American evangelicalism, having departed somewhat from strict Presbyterianism. Hart and Muether, 20, 106.

Evangelical theology or evangelicalism is similar to Reformation theology or orthodox theological formulation. For example, it stands for the authority of the Bible, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and God's sovereignty in salvation. I. S. Rennie, "Evangelical Theology," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988);

is good to emphasize the idea of *sola gratia* in salvation, although the revivalism of Edwards was criticized by some people because of its *experimental* aspects.⁴⁹

Does God answer the prayer for revival? During the Second Great Awakening, Timothy Dwight highlighted the role of the human will in revival. He built a bridge to the new evangelicalism with his distinctive “Arminianized Calvinism.”⁵⁰ Dwight wished to unite Calvinism and the theology of John Wesley. However, he eventually paved the way for the theology of Nathaniel William Taylor (1786-1858) and Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875).⁵¹ Dwight believed that God commands human beings to “cooperate with Him in praying and preaching for revival.”⁵² As Guelzo points out, Dwight supported the idea of Arminian revivalism:

He [Dwight] never explicitly repudiated his famous grandfather [Edwards], and indeed was fond of insisting that he was entirely in harmony with the Edwardseans on such issues as the atonement and imputation.... Dwight further legitimized this condition by aggressively promoting that ultimate imprimatur of Edwardseanism—the revival—three times during his tenure at Yale, in 1802, 1808, and 1813.⁵³

“Evangelicalism,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

⁴⁹ Robert W. Jenson, *America's Theologian: A Recommendation of Jonathan Edwards* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 57-59. Due to an emphasis on the “genuine experience of conversion,” Edwards was severely criticized by Charles Chauncy, an Arminian. Hardman, 72-73.

⁵⁰ Hardman, 116.

⁵¹ Ibid., 116. Establishing the New Haven Theology as a follower of Timothy Dwight, Taylor rejected Edwards's definition of the will, depending on the power of the will “even more than Wesley.” For Taylor, depravity is *selfish choice*, “not a quality that inheres originally in a nature; it is a primal action of the soul.” Allen C. Guelzo, *Edwards on the Will: A Century of American Theological Debate* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989), 240-44, 260-65; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 74; Murray, *Revival*, 259-61, 273-74; Hardman, 116-17, 144-45.

⁵² As a “good strategist” for revivals, Dwight organized people for the effective result of awakenings. Hardman, 116-17; Guelzo, 242.

⁵³ Guelzo, 248-49.

Hence, human beings are left with absolute freedom in the theology of Dwight's Arminian revivalism. He believed that God's will in revivals is directed by human decision, so it seems that free human acts in salvation become necessary. If human acts are truly free, then it would seem that they are unconnected with God's sovereign grace in revivals. At this point, Dwight was not persuaded by the Calvinistic theology. Certainly, he had no interest in defending the Calvinistic concept of the bondage of the will.⁵⁴ In other words, Dwight was not fully satisfied with the theology of Jonathan Edwards.

The Presbyterian evangelist Charles Finney started a new trend in revivalism during the Second Great Awakening. The theology of Nathaniel Taylor was adapted by Finney "to make regeneration easy."⁵⁵ Finney was willing to invalidate not only the teachings of the Westminster Confession, but also Calvinism as formulated in Taylor's theology.⁵⁶ Finney finally developed the movement of "new measures": a movement of "protracted meetings" that were held in one place over a period of several days.⁵⁷ No

⁵⁴ At this point, Joseph Haroutunian fails to understand Dwight's view, as he calls Dwight "a decent Calvinist." Dwight clearly departed from the theology of Edwards or that of Calvin not only in the concept of free will, but also with regard to God's sovereign will in salvation. Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1932), 248-49; Guelzo, 221-30.

⁵⁵ Murray, *Revival*, 261; Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 74. It is not quite wrong for some scholars like Hart and Muether to insist that Finney imported the theology of "Methodists" for his revivalism. But it would be more accurate to say that Finney borrowed from New Haven Theology to build up his revivalist theology. Cf. Hart and Muether, 20.

⁵⁶ Murray, *Revival*, 255-59.

⁵⁷ Finney saw the new measures as the "essence" of revivals. Murray, *Revival*, 237-41. Along with the movement of the new measures, Finney offered the *anxious bench or seat*, a place up front where people could come and sit if they felt "anxious" enough to be converted. This was Finney's distinctive innovation. Murray, *Revival*, 242-43, 283; Deok Kuo Oh, *A History of the Presbyterians* (Suwon, Korea: Hapdong Presbyterian Theological Seminary Press, 2000), 233-34; "Charles Finney," in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 612-13.

other American Presbyterian preacher gave people such a strong sense of “emotion, feeling, and excitement to revival” than Charles Finney until the late nineteenth century.⁵⁸ Nearly all of the new measures were intentionally designed to “induce a response in those hearing the gospel.”⁵⁹ It became all the more important to stress these new measures for revivals. Finney’s new measures symbolized the emotional kind of Arminian revivalism. It is no accident that the new measures became popular, as Iain Murray correctly summarizes its influence:

First, the claim that they were justified by massive success appeared so feasible that biblical warrant for their use seemed to be unnecessary. Scripture was not the decisive criterion.... Secondly, all Christians rightly want to see success, and the new measures seemed to offer that possibility in a way not known before. Thirdly, the introduction of the new measures in a time of real revival gave weight to the claim that their ‘success’ was due to divine blessing. And, finally, the illusion was ultimately accepted because the alleged successes received far more publicity than did the evidence of harm done to the life of the churches.⁶⁰

For the most part, revivals could bring *special excitement* “by means and measures.”⁶¹ The Arminian theology of Finney stressed a personal response to the gospel, attacking Calvinism.⁶² In Finney’s concept of revivalism, there was no place for God’s sovereign grace at all.⁶³ The rise of Finney’s revivalism, then, shaped “new channels” for

⁵⁸ Murray, *Revival*, 243.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 243.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 298. I strongly believe that Murray’s analysis of Finney’s new measures is legitimate.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 294.

⁶² Iain Murray sees Finney’s theology as a Pelagian one, due to his doctrine of man. Murray, *Revival*, 249-50; Hart and Muether, 20, 51, 106.

⁶³ Finney saw regeneration as a change of “a moral character” in the “attitude of the will.” He stressed human freedom in terms of morality. Charles Finney, *Finney’s Systematic Theology* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1976), 219-21. Denouncing the doctrine of justification in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Finney firmly affirmed the teaching of universal atonement, a teaching that Christ’s atonement is

emphasizing “intense feeling” throughout “American evangelicalism.”⁶⁴ Unfortunately, Calvinism in America was severely damaged by Finney’s Arminian revivalism.

In conclusion, although the influence of Reformation theology has been great in the Protestant churches, Timothy Dwight and Charles Finney did not accept the Calvinistic view of revivalism, unlike Jonathan Edwards. Preparationist Puritanism has been employed by many New England theologians like Dwight. Many of their actual arguments, however influenced by the preparationist Puritanism, are quite consistent with the Arminian emphasis on the power of the will in salvation. With the new measures, Charles Finney brought a new revivalism to America. Severely attacking the Calvinistic view of regeneration, Finney argued for using methods that produced *successful* results in revivals. The idea of the sovereign grace of God in salvation was completely ruled out by Finney’s emphasis on the *absolute* power of the will in salvation. Edwards is right, however, to point out that revivals take place by the sovereign act of God, not by the preparatory works of man.

for “the whole posterity of Adam.” Ibid., 334-35. On this basis, Finney applied God’s grace to Christ’s atonement only, not to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.

⁶⁴ As Marsden points out, Finney’s *intense feeling* could also be exercised in the *social religious meeting*, “small groups gathered for prayer, Bible study, witnessing, and song.” Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 45.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NECESSITY OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS FOR THE WICKED

In the previous chapter 2, we briefly discussed the idea of revivalism in relation to the gospel. We saw that an emphasis on human responsibility in revivals correlates with an emphasis on the power of the human will in salvation. As we have seen, the views on revivalism can be summarized by saying (1) that revivals can occur only by the sovereign act of God, or (2) that revivals can occur by human preparatory works.¹ The discussion of revivalism prepares us to look at the views of Augustine and some medieval thinkers on divine grace and the views of Luther and Calvin on justification. This chapter will treat the following subjects: (1) the necessity of the grace of God, (2) the justification of the wicked, and (3) the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Reformation theology.² Before proceeding to consider the historical background of the Reformation doctrine of justification, it is appropriate to ask how the fifth-century debate between Augustine and Pelagius on divine grace affected medieval thinkers.

A. The Necessity of the Grace of God

¹ The former was called the Calvinistic view and the latter the Arminian view of revivalism.

² After discussing Augustine's *sola gratia*, in the section of *the justification of the wicked*, we will deal with original sin, God's grace, free will, faith, and the necessity of Christ's righteousness. Then we will continue to examine the doctrine of *the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Reformation theology*, by dealing with justification, election, legal union, and the imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness.

The fifth-century debate between Augustine (354-430) and Pelagius should warn us to weigh the importance of God's grace with the gospel, because the foundation of the gospel was challenged by the views of Pelagius at the time of Augustine. Augustine saw Pelagius as an adversary of the gospel, particularly because of Pelagius's views of Adam's sin and human ability.

Pelagius drew quite different conclusions from Augustine by affirming the idea that man had natural ability to do good works. By his emphasis on the power of human nature, Pelagius did not affirm the necessity of God's grace in salvation. For Pelagius, man, even after the Fall, had the natural ability to avoid sin.³ He argued that every man was born with the same ability which Adam had before the Fall. Thus, there is a fundamental difference with respect to human ability: Pelagius saw this natural ability as a gift of God's grace, while Augustine answered that the grace of God is necessary for salvation due to the fallen will.

How then are we to understand the grace of God in Augustine? The anger of Augustine over Pelagius led him to write *On Nature and Grace*. Augustine was aware of the error of Pelagius and described human nature as corrupt and incapable of turning to God. Augustine concluded that without the "free grace of God" no one could be saved:

This grace, however, of Christ, without which neither infants nor adults can be saved, is not rendered for any merits, but is given *gratis*, on account of which it is also called *grace*. "Being justified," says the apostle [Paul], "freely through His blood."⁴ Whence they, who are not liberated through grace, either because yet able to hear, or because they are unwilling to obey; or again because they did not

³ Alister McGrath, *Justification by Faith: What It Means for Us Today* (Grand Rapids: Academic Books, 1988), 35-39; Reinhold Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), 331-38; Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953), 173-81; R. C. Sproul, *Willing to Believe: The Controversy over Free Will* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1997), 33-45.

⁴ Romans 3:24.

receive, at the time when they were unable on account of youth to hear, that bath of regeneration, which they might have received and through which they might have been saved, are indeed justly condemned; because they are not without sin, either that which they have derived from their birth, or that which they have added from their own misconduct.⁵

In *On Nature and Grace*, by attacking Pelagius's doctrine of original sin,

Augustine says that "all" in Romans 3:23 means "the generations both of old and modern times, both ourselves and our posterity."⁶ Augustine's notion of original sin differs so radically from that of Pelagius that it is almost impossible to establish the foundation of the gospel without a proper understanding of original sin. Pelagius cannot agree with Augustine's conclusions regarding the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity.⁷ Due to human inability, for Augustine, the human will must be restored by God alone. Augustine seeks to answer the question, "On what basis does God save us?" It is important to note that for Augustine, God's grace is an "efficacious power" working on the human will, which renews us.⁸ As Augustine says in one place, by his grace God works in us to "incline" our will to be converted so that we can have eternal life.⁹ To

⁵ Augustine, *On Nature and Grace*, in *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 122 (italics not added).

⁶ Ibid., 137.

⁷ Augustine, *On Original Sin*, 5:241, 244-45. For Pelagius, Adam's sin damaged "only himself." Ibid., 5:242. McGrath, *Justification*, 39-41; G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies In Dogmatics: Sin* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 428-35, 53-37; Sproul, *Willing*, 33-45. We will discuss the notion of imputation in the third section of this chapter, (3) the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Reformation theology.

⁸ Augustine, *On Nature and Free Will*, 5:457; McGrath, *Justification*, 41-43.

⁹ Augustine, 5:461-63. According to Augustine, God "stirs" our spirit to be converted. Ibid., 5:462.

Augustine, we are saved solely by the “simply grace” of God, not by our own merits.¹⁰ In this sense, the soul is not active, but passive in its reception of God’s grace in salvation.

It is important to note that when Augustine brings a charge against Pelagius’s notion of God’s grace, he speaks of Pelagius’s stress on the power of “natural capacity” as an erroneous teaching.¹¹ In *On the Grace of Christ*, Augustine is attempting to deal with the problem of Pelagius’s concept of grace and freedom. The power of the “natural capacity” is the issue, that is, a person’s ability to perform free acts in salvation. Augustine points out that Pelagius roots out the grace of God in salvation. The “good ability,” for Pelagius, is free choice, and its role is nothing more than human ability to choose God’s grace in salvation. To Pelagius, it is possible to speak of a sinner’s being saved or earning salvation without the grace of God.¹²

Augustine discards human meritorious works in salvation. Human beings, he argues, are justified by faith through God’s grace alone.¹³ By grace alone (*sola gratia*), God crowns them not with human merits, but with his gifts; that is, human beings are crowned with God’s righteousness by his grace alone.¹⁴ Augustine says that by faith human beings can be made God’s righteousness in Christ, for Christ became sin for

¹⁰ Ibid., 5:460. In this sense, it is the prevenient grace of God.

¹¹ To Pelagius, the “natural capacity” is assisted by God’s grace. But in his theology, God’s grace means “the law and teaching.” Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5: 220, 229. In the same sense, Augustine also attacks his idea that Christ is our “example for imitation.” Ibid., 5:232. Augustine rightly says that Pelagius’s notion of God’s grace is “absolutely uncertain.” Ibid., 5:231.

¹² Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5:224; McGrath, *Justification*, 42-43. For Pelagius, there is a “good will” in us. Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5:224. Since Pelagius calls the natural ability of man God’s grace, he does not deny his grace, but understands it as something natural and not as God’s attitude towards the wicked.

¹³ Augustine, *On Original Sin*, 5:247.

¹⁴ Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, 5:450.

them.¹⁵ Augustine continues to hold this ground that we are justified by faith through God's grace alone:¹⁶

From these and similar passages of Scripture,¹⁷ we gather the proof that God's grace is not given according to our merits. The truth is, we see that it is given not only where there are no good, but even where there are many evil merits preceding: and we see it so given daily.... Thus, it is necessary for a man that he should be not only justified when unrighteous by the grace of God,—that is, be changed from unholiness to righteousness,—when he is requited with good for his evil; but that, even after he has become justified by faith, grace should accompany him on his way, and he should lean upon it, lest he fall.¹⁸

Augustine's point was crucial to the fifth century because God's grace was not a well-understood doctrine previously. Augustine provided a proper understanding to the fifth century in his discussion of the doctrine of grace, which enables us to see the absolute necessity of God's grace in salvation. What is remarkable here is that Augustine strongly defends the necessity of God's righteousness in salvation against the Pelagians. Augustine is able to put the gospel on firm ground through the doctrine of the grace of God.¹⁹

Thus, Augustine can be called the father of the Reformation because of his doctrines of sin and grace.²⁰ However, Augustine does not say anything explicitly about

¹⁵ Augustine, *On Original Sin*, 5:247-48, 250, 255.

¹⁶ Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, 5:449. In his *Confessions* and *The City of God*, Augustine clearly supports the *irresistible* grace of God in salvation. Philip Schaff, ed. *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vols. 1 and 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983).

¹⁷ Here Augustine uses 1 Cor. 15:9, 10; 2 Cor. 6:1; 2 Tim. 1:8-9; Titus 3:3, 4-7.

¹⁸ Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, 5:449.

¹⁹ Sproul acknowledges that it is "*irresistible* because it is effectual, accomplishing God's purpose in giving it." Sproul, *Willing*, 51. Basically, Augustine supports the notion of the irresistible grace of God.

²⁰ Ibid., 49-52; David F. Wright, "Augustine (354-430)" and "Augustinianism," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988);

the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Augustine does not articulate the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner; he does, however, introduce the headship of Adam as a representative of the human race and the headship of Christ as the representative of Christians. Let us look at his own words on this point:

If, however, as the Truth says through His apostles, even as all die in Adam, even so shall all be made alive in Christ; forasmuch as the resurrection of death comes through the one man, even as death comes through the other man; what Christian man can be bold enough to doubt that even those righteous men who pleased God in the more remote periods of the human race are destined to attain to the resurrection of eternal life, and not eternal death, because they shall be made alive in Christ, because they belong to the body of Christ? that they belong to the body of Christ, because Christ is the head even to them?²¹ and that Christ is the head even to them because there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus? But this He could not have been to them, unless through His grace they have believed in His resurrection.²²

Augustine expresses the idea of Christian's union with Christ, especially in relation to the grace of Christ. Augustine also notes that while it is Christ who is their "head" and they belong to the "body of Christ," the works of Christ become the believers'. Augustine uses an image of a body in describing union with Christ, in which Christians become one with Christ. However, he does not fully specify that the image of the body is applied to oneness with Christ in justification. In this respect, neither the doctrine of the headships of Adam and Christ nor the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner is fully developed in Augustine's theology. More

Seeberg, 338-57. Augustine, however, makes it clear that one's conversion cannot take place without baptism. Thus, Augustine is not entirely in harmony with the Reformers on this point, as he has a very different notion of baptism. Augustine, *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, 5:404; Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5:232; Augustine, *On Original Sin*, 5:253. See also Seeberg, 322-23.

²¹ 1 Cor. 11:3.

²² Augustine, *On Original Sin*, 5:248. As important as God's grace, the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin is found in Augustine's theology. It is important to note that this concept lays the foundation

important is the fact that Augustine is very successful in pointing out Pelagius's distortion of the merit of Christ's work for salvation.

In summary, Augustine's doctrine of grace holds that justification takes place by faith through God's grace alone.²³ Doubtless for Pelagius, sin does not make it impossible for man to act rightly without the help of God's grace. At this point, Augustine's main thrust is that salvation is *sola gratia*. Augustine greatly contributes to the doctrine of salvation *sola gratia* in church history.

Augustine's triumph over Pelagianism in the fifth century had a remarkable influence on Western theology. The doctrine of grace in the theology of apostle Paul was well developed since the days of Augustine. Due to Augustine's victory over Pelagianism, the Western Church completely rejected Pelagianism throughout the Middle Ages.²⁴ The Western Church clearly taught that God's grace is necessary for salvation and that no one can be saved apart from grace. Pelagianism was universally condemned in Western theology throughout church history. In the Middle Ages, no one was willing to call himself Pelagian, even though he might have Pelagian views on the doctrine of salvation. Pelagians tended to speak of *meritum de condigno* (condign merit), while Augustinians spoke of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) in the Middle Ages.

for Augustine's doctrine of grace. John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959), 24-36; Sproul, *Willing*, 54.

²³ Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5:236; *On Original Sin*, 5:247, 248, 253-55; *A Treatise against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, 5:408, 414, 413; *On Grace and Free Will*, 5:449, 451-54. In Augustine's theology, love comes from God. Augustine, *On the Grace of Christ*, 5:221, 225-28; Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, 5:438-60. Also, the declarative nature of justification by faith alone is absent in Augustine's theology. McGrath, *Justification*, 43-44.

²⁴ Latourette, 173-81; Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985), 206-209.

In the Middle Ages, there were great debates going on. “Can I be right before God with *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit)?” “Can I become meritorious enough to deserve salvation?” “Does God’s grace become my merit before him?” Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, also struggled with the question, “How can we be justified with free will before God?” Aquinas explained how God’s grace works with free will. It is important to listen to him in order to see the historical background of the Reformation. According to Aquinas, when God gives grace, we receive it with our free will. For Aquinas, we “cooperate with God’s grace,” so that we possess it as our merit. Aquinas’s doctrine of merit starts with *congruous* merit, but eventually turns out to be our “worthy merit” (*condign* merit) at the end of the process of justification.²⁵ This is the key to understanding Aquinas’s doctrine of justification: God’s grace saves those who cooperate with their free will. After human beings receive God’s grace in Aquinas’s theology, his grace becomes their merit. Hence, Aquinas’s doctrine of justification shows that sinners are changed by God’s grace and that they are made *godly* at the end of the process. On this basis, one can maintain that we are *godly* after the completion of justification, while the Reformers like Martin Luther and John Calvin believed that we are still *ungodly* after we are declared righteous by God. With his doctrine of free will, Aquinas opened the door to Nominalism.

Johannes Duns Scotus (1256-1308) and his followers were inclined to interpret Aquinas’s doctrine of free will in a different way. Scotus and the Nominalists, who

²⁵ Seeberg, vol. II, 119-23, 103, 116. Seeberg calls *condign* merit (*meritum de condigno*) “the merit of worthiness” and *congruous* merit (*meritum de congruo*) “the merit of fitness.” And “the former term describes the conduct in so far as it is purely a product of grace; the second, in so far as it results from the exercise of free will.” Ibid., 122. Martin Luther opposed the idea of congruous merit. Sproul, *Grace Unknown*, 64.

argued that God is free and that he has made us free, were trying to offer more details about the will and freedom of God. The most startling part of their doctrine is that they needed to stress the power of the human will, just as they stressed the freedom of God. Rather than make God's grace a primary source in salvation, they argued that we must cooperate with grace in salvation according to God's will. The most important questions in this crucial debate are how the human will works in salvation and what the relationship between God's will and the freedom of the human will is. Scotus believed that after the Fall human beings could merit the gift of grace by *facere quod in se est* (doing what is in him).²⁶ Resisting the Augustinian doctrine of grace, Scotus emphasized the supremacy of the will, while Thomas stressed the role of reason over the will.²⁷ In Scotus's theology, whatever was acceptable to God was acceptable in terms of *pactum* (covenant). In Scotus' theology, it was all simply based on God's will.

What is Scotus's notion of justification? Scotus argues that human beings are prepared to receive the infusion of grace through the sacrament of *repentance*.²⁸ We should be prepared for God's righteousness only by the act of our free cooperation with grace, that is, only by the act of *repentance*. In Scotus's theology, justification by God's grace is conditional. It must be noted that God's will, which is known to Scotus by revelation, is the cause of justification, not human merit. In other words, for Scotus justification is covenanted by God according to his own will. Therefore, those who follow the covenant of God will be saved by the cooperating act of the human will. For

²⁶ Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform: 1250-1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 231-39.

²⁷ "John Duns Scotus (1255/6-1308)" in *New Dictionary of Theology*.

²⁸ Seeberg, 158-61.

Scotus, *meritum de condigno* (condign merit) is unacceptable; only *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) is acceptable. Scotus and most of the later Nominalists tended to be more Pelagian.²⁹ The ideas of Scotus were very popular in the medieval churches. William of Occam (1285-1347) and Gabriel Biel (1420-1495) supported Scotus's doctrine of salvation. At the time of the Reformation, Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) promoted their doctrine of free will in salvation.³⁰

In the sixteenth century, Martin Luther (1483-1546) faced one of the most crucial challenges in church history—that of rebuilding the foundation of the gospel after the Scholastic and Nominalist distortions of the doctrines of God's grace and free will. It was necessary for Luther to examine the question, "How can I be right before God?"³¹ In Romans 1:17, "The just shall live by faith," Luther found that a sinner is *justified by faith through Christ alone*, that "faith justifies without any works" through Christ alone. And faith is "a divine work in us. It changes us and makes us to be born anew of God (John 1)."³² Luther sought to prove that Christ's righteousness is freely given to us without

²⁹ This is why Luther was opposed to the absolute freedom of the will in salvation. Luther knew that the Nominalist doctrine of merit could not be destroyed unless their doctrine of the freedom of the will was destroyed.

³⁰ Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, The Beginnings to the Reformation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 166-79; Seeberg, 148ff., 197-203; Heiko H. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1983), 156, 157-72; Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements: vol. 2, The Reformation* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 308; Ozment, 33-42.

³¹ Luther's spiritual breakthrough on the doctrine of justification seems to have come at the end of a long spiritual journey. It must have taken him more than ten years to realize the truth of the gospel. In 1505, Luther had his famous lightening bolt experience--where a lightening bolt hit near him. After *the tower experience* in 1515, he learned from Paul's letter to the Romans that God's righteousness is made available to all people. Finally, Luther understood Paul's teaching that God's love is unconditional. Ozment, 223-31.

³² I have quoted this from his Preface to *Romans*. Luther wrote *Romans* in 1515, but he wrote his Preface to it in 1552. Martin Luther, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. J. Theodore Mueller (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1976), xv, xxxi.

human meritorious works. He discovered that the truth of gospel in the Middle Ages had been severely damaged.

In September 1517, Luther called people's attention to the fact that Pelagianism permitted human merit in salvation when he wrote *Disputation against Scholastic Theology*.³³ Medieval theology had made a fundamental error in appropriating Aristotle and thus making reason a guide for life and for contemplating God. The more Luther perceived errors in Nominalism, especially its Pelagian tendencies, the more he moved away from Aristotelian influence in theology.³⁴ Luther's *Disputation against Scholastic Theology* showed that he was unable to accept the Ockhamist's view of *facere quod in se est* (doing what is in him) and *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit). Basically, Luther stood against Pelagians as well as the scholastics and Ockhamists in the *Disputation*, for he linked scholastics to Pelagians and Ockhamists.³⁵ Luther became more and more firmly Augustinian, while stressing the importance of God's grace in salvation due to human inability.

B. The Justification of the Wicked

³³ Luther's advocacy of God's grace developed from his admiration of Augustine's doctrine of justification: "To say that Augustine exaggerates in speaking against heretics is to say that Augustine tells lies almost everywhere (No. 1)." In this *Disputation*, Luther makes a strong Augustinian statement in the medieval context: "Man is by nature unable to want God to be God. Indeed he himself wants to be God, and does not want God to be God (No. 17)." It is undeniable that this *Disputation* clearly indicated the inability of the human will to participate in salvation (No. 16). Here Luther supports the Augustinian concept of grace (Nos. 33, 40). Convinced that reason can tell us nothing about God, Luther claims that "the whole Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light (No. 50)." In this *Disputation*, Luther attacks Pelagius, John Duns Scotus, Gabriel Biel, Manichaeism, and also Aristotle. Timothy F. Lull, ed., *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 13-20.

³⁴ Ozment, 231-39.

³⁵ The view of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) comes from Scotus's view of the *donum superadditum* (superadded gift). Scotus argued that after the Fall, fallen human beings might merit the gift of salvation. Ozment, 235-38.

We have seen in the previous section that Luther promoted Augustine's theology of grace. Certainly anyone who accepts the Augustinian view of grace must be considered an Augustinian, even if he differs from Augustine in other areas. At any rate, we should now proceed to analyze the views of the Reformers and some other related issues regarding the doctrine of justification. We cannot look at all Reformation theologians, of course, so we will focus on the Reformers who are especially significant in this regard and examine their interaction with others.³⁶

Reformation Theology

1. Martin Luther (1483-1546)

Unlike some other medieval theologians, Luther spoke against the abuses of indulgences when he nailed the *95 Theses* to the door of the church at Wittenberg on October 31, 1517.³⁷ In the *95 Theses*, Luther stresses the exclusive merits of Christ in salvation by objecting to the concept of merit held by the Roman Catholic Church.³⁸ Luther strenuously declared that the gospel of the "glory and grace of God" is the "true treasure of the church."³⁹ Here we see Augustinian *sola gratia* without meritorious works in salvation. This idea of God's grace has its roots in the teachings of Augustine.⁴⁰

³⁶ This section will discuss Reformation theology and the rise of moralism in post-Reformation theology. However, not every theologian connected with the doctrine of justification can be discussed, and even the analysis of those theologians who are discussed will be limited and focused on unique doctrinal discussions of *sola gratia*, original sin, Christ's righteousness, free will, and faith.

³⁷ After arguing that the idea of Purgatory is not biblical, Luther strongly attacks the abuses of indulgences directly and indirectly. For instance, he says, "Those who believe that they can be certain of their salvation because they have indulgence letters will be eternally damned, together with their teachers." *Theses* 32. "Let him who speaks against the truth concerning papal indulgences be anathema and accursed." *Theses* 71. Lull, *Luther*, 21-29. For the abuses of indulgences, see *Theses* 21-95.

³⁸ *Theses* 60.

No more than the doctrine of indulgences, Luther could not tolerate the doctrine of free will as advanced in the humanist movement.⁴¹ Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) was the foremost humanist to speak against Luther. In 1524, Erasmus wrote *A Diatribe on the Freedom of the Will*.⁴² By “free choice,” Erasmus meant a power of the will by which one could seek eternal salvation or turn away from it.⁴³ Erasmus reproduced Ockham’s doctrine of the human will. Is the will related to a freedom of choice in salvation? Does man have the ability to come to God by himself? Erasmus’s argument, like Biel’s, was that even though free choice was damaged by sin, it was not totally destroyed by it. To Erasmus, the will must be seen as having free choice, cooperating with grace in salvation. Erasmus insisted that there was a period of progress that could be attributed to grace, but a portion of that progress could be attributed to free will.⁴⁴ In

³⁹ *Theses* 62. Luther’s support of the Augustinian concept of grace is clearly shown in his use the words “grace” and “gospel” in the 95 *Theses*. For the word “grace,” see *Theses* 62, 67, 68, 77, 78. For the word “gospel,” see *Theses* 62, 65, 78.

⁴⁰ Although Luther’s strong belief in the doctrine of justification does not appear in the 95 *Theses*, his 95 *Theses* can be seen as the starting point of the Reformation. *The Freedom of a Christian* (1520) speaks more of the doctrine of justification than the 95 *Theses*. Perhaps “Two Kinds of Righteousness (1519)” can be included in this category. Luther, in my view, develops the doctrine of justification more in *The Freedom of a Christian* than in “Two Kinds of Righteousness.” See Eric W. Gritsch, ed., *Martin Luther: Faith in Christ and the Gospel* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1996), 83-93.

⁴¹ The Renaissance emphasized the *studia humanitatis* (or “the humanities”), reviving ancient learning. Humanists, or “students of ancient humanities,” sought to learn from ancient texts. Along with a rediscovering the ancient world, humanists encouraged people to learn ancient languages. The humanist movement opened the door to the Reformation by showing the importance of studying ancient languages. Alister E. McGrath, *Luther’s Theology of the Cross* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 40-53; Spitz, 301-6, 333, 388-89, 397, 448-49, 472-74, 557-80.

⁴² Erasmus said that the only people who would agree with Luther’s view on freedom of the will were John Wycliffe and Laurentius Valla. For Erasmus and Luther, see Ozment, *Age*, 290-302; Martin Luther, *Bondage of the Will*, trans. J.I. Packer & O. R. Johnston (Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1997), 109.

⁴³ There is no doubt that Erasmus was influenced by Scholasticism. Oberman, 164; Luther, *Bondage*, 48-51, 137.

1525, Luther struck a fatal blow against Erasmus's doctrine of the freedom of the will in *The Bondage of the Will*.⁴⁵

Now, since, on God's own testimony, men are 'flesh,' they can savour of nothing but the flesh; therefore 'free-will' can avail only to sin. And if, while the Spirit of God is calling and teaching among them, they go from bad to worse, what could they do when left to themselves, without the Spirit of God?⁴⁶

It seems clear that Luther, by criticizing Erasmus's humanism, is determined to defend the inability of man to obtain salvation. "If sin abounds by the law," Luther asks, "how is it possible for man to prepare himself by moral works for the favor of God?"⁴⁷ Luther's argument shows that the human will can only produce sinful acts without the help of God.⁴⁸ In *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther consistently maintains the supremacy of God's grace in salvation. However, a genuine difference remains. Erasmus sees the actions of the will as something worth designating as "freedom," arguing the Scholastic notion that human beings can gain salvation in their own strength. Luther, while not accepting Erasmus's denial of *condign* merit, sees him as a semi-Pelagian who is actually worse than a Pelagian:

⁴⁴ J. I. Packer and O. R. Johnston, "Historical and Theological Introduction," in Martin Luther, *Bondage*, 48-50; McGrath, *Luther's Theology*, 45.

⁴⁵ Luther is a thorough Augustinian. With his doctrine of the will, Luther distinguishes himself from humanists. Luther accuses Erasmus of "harming" people with his position. Luther, *Bondage*, 96. For Luther's doctrine of Scripture, see *ibid.*, 123-34.

⁴⁶ Luther, *Bondage*, 241. In *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther severely criticizes Erasmus. Luther argues that the heart of the issue is not a theological abstraction, but the essence of the gospel. Luther claims here that Christianity must declare what God has done in salvation, and what man can do. *Ibid.*, 74-79.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁴⁸ Luther is attacking Erasmus's definition of free will. Erasmus sees "free will" as "a power of the human will by which a man may apply himself to those things that lead to eternal salvation, or turn away from the same." *Ibid.*, 137.

Though in what they say and write they profess that they do not attain grace to condign merit, nor call the merit in question ‘condign,’ they are only trying to fool us by a word, for they hold the thing none the less. What can excuse their not calling it condign merit, when they assign to it all that pertains to condign merit?... The guardians of ‘free-will’ have exemplified the saying: ‘out of the frying-pan, into the fire.’ In their zeal to disagree with the Pelagians, they start denying condign merit, and by the very form of their denial they set it up more firmly! By word and pen they deny it, but really, in their hearts, they establish it, and are worse than the Pelagians upon two accounts.⁴⁹

Luther’s belief that the will is not free and that grace is given necessarily comes from Augustine’s *sola gratia*. Clearly, Luther believes that *sola gratia* implies the necessity of God’s righteousness in salvation. With an emphasis on *sola gratia*, Luther represents an entirely different line of thinking from the Roman Catholic Church—that of *sola scriptura*.⁵⁰ *Sola scriptura* means that Scripture is the only binding source of absolute authority above all things.⁵¹ What Luther brings to life with *sola gratia* and *sola scriptura* is the gospel. In *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther brought up not only *sola scriptura*, but also *sola gratia*, speaking of the necessity of God’s righteousness:

Here [Romans 3:21-26] Paul utters very thunderous against ‘free-will.’ First, ‘The righteousness of God without the law,’ he says, ‘is manifested.’ He distinguishes the righteousness of God from the righteousness of the law; because the righteousness of faith comes by grace, without the law. His phrase ‘without the law’ can mean only that Christian righteousness exists without the works of the law, the works of the law availing and effecting nothing towards its attainment.... From all this it is very plain that the endeavor and effort of ‘free-will’ are simply null; for if the righteousness of God exists without the law, and without the works of the law, how shall it not much more exist without ‘free-will’? For the supreme concern of ‘free-will’ is to exercise itself in moral righteousness, the works of that law by

⁴⁹ Ibid., 293.

⁵⁰ G.C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Holy Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), 300-308.

⁵¹ About the doctrine of *sola scriptura*, Luther wrote most remarkable works in 1520: “The Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation,” *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, and *The Freedom of a Christian*.

which its blindness and impotence are ‘assisted.’ But this word ‘without’ does away with morally good works, and moral righteousness, and preparations for grace.⁵²

Luther also used the phrase *simul iustus et peccator*, which means “simultaneously just and a sinner.”⁵³ With this idea of *simul iustus et peccator*, Luther offered a reasonable response to the medieval belief that believers become *godly* (meritorious) after the completion of justification. Luther fought against the doctrine of human ability to do good works, as taught by the Pelagians and the Scholastics. For Thomas Aquinas, faith must have a form to be a *saving faith*. And the form of faith is love. Aquinas and other medieval theologians were convinced that we are saved by faith alone, yet *working by love*.⁵⁴ It is important to understand that for James works are a necessary consequence of saving faith. Paul unfolds the fact of justification in the life of Abraham in Romans, while James sees the evidence of justification in Abraham’s life. For Luther, the act of love is not meritorious. It is the evidence of saving faith.⁵⁵ When

⁵² Luther, *Bondage*, 289. For Luther, God’s grace is given by the Holy Spirit alone. He says, “The Spirit alone works both blessings in us, regenerating us, and preserving us when regenerate, without ourselves.” Ibid., 268. It is God’s grace for the undeserving: “He pours out grace and mercy upon the unworthy.” Ibid., 234-35. For the necessity of God’s grace, see *ibid.*, 270.

⁵³ Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians: Modern English Version* (Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1999), 150. It was published in 1535. Luther’s *Galatians* is one of the most important books for the understanding of his doctrine of justification, along with *The Bondage of the Will* and *The Freedom of a Christian*.

⁵⁴ Luther attacked the typical idea of the medieval theologians, that when grace really became one’s own, it turned out to be meritorious. Luther understood that grace is received because of God’s word. Luther showed that the medieval theologians left the Scriptures out of their doctrine of justification and endorsed the authority of the church instead. Ozment, 1-115. Luther recognized the importance of bearing fruit in the Christian life. “Nothing makes a man good except faith,” but one will know the believers by “their fruits.” Now faith is “truly active through love (Gal. 5:6).” It is likely that Luther saw “the inner man” in terms of justification and “the outer man” in terms of sanctification. He clearly saw that the fruits of faith are the evidence of justification. Lull, *Luther*, 86, 614-15. Regarding love, see Luther, *Galatians*, 392. Regarding good works, see *ibid.*, 340, 350.

⁵⁵ James’s conviction that your faith is dead if you do not love or serve is not really a justifying faith. Only a living, active, and working faith is the genuine faith which produces fruit in the Christian life. Luther does not see a harmonious relation between Paul and James, even though he believes that love is the manifestation of genuine faith. Luther does not find the relationship between faith and works in the Epistle

Luther spoke of *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously just and a sinner), he meant that once a person was justified, the process of sanctification began necessarily and immediately, although the person was not completely sanctified. Luther declared that all the meritorious works are attributed to Christ alone for the justification of the sinner. In short, Luther taught that justification is by faith alone, but not by faith that is alone. Without *sola fide* we do not have the gospel. Yet, he said, saving faith must produce its fruits.

2. John Calvin (1509-1564)

John Calvin was a second-generation Reformer, who was committed to Luther's doctrine of justification and also fought against the idea of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) in salvation, an idea that human beings must cooperate with inherent grace to obtain salvation.⁵⁶ How do they obtain God's righteousness? Calvin clearly set forth the *synthetic* view of justification in his *Institutes of Christian Religion* of 1559, over against the *analytical* view of the medieval Roman Catholic Church.⁵⁷ In his

of James. Luther, *Galatians*, 332-35, 350-51; Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 84-85, 246, 337, 446-58; G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 130-31, 134-39.

⁵⁶ Calvin strongly emphasizes the importance of justification. Justification, Calvin says, is the "main hinge on which religion turns." John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battle, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 3.11.1. In 1554, people asked Calvin to write *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* on the urgent necessity for the Reformation. Calvin suggested the doctrine of justification as a crucial tool to correct the "corruptions of the church." Calvin claimed that the doctrine of *justification by faith alone* made reformation necessary, for it is "the ground of salvation." John Calvin, *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* (Audubon, NJ: Old Paths Publications, 1994), 80. Cf. Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification from 1500 to the Present Day* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 26; Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 626; Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 971-75, 991; Ozment, 28.

Institutes, Calvin defended the necessity of Christ's righteousness for the wicked in justification. On the contrary, the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification showed the *analytical* view that human beings did not need to add the *alien* righteousness of Christ. In the *analytical* view of justification, they are declared righteous in God's analysis, because they are found to be just.⁵⁸ But Calvin's doctrine of justification had the *synthetic* view that for the justification of the sinner something must be added to human beings: the imputed righteousness of Christ.

During the period when Scholasticism was exercising its greatest influence, Calvin's theology was coming to the forefront. Calvin's *synthetic* doctrine of justification was in competition with the medieval theologians for the hearts and minds of people in the sixteenth century. As the Scholastics were inclined to have a meritorious view of works-righteousness in justification, Calvin had a nonmeritorious view of faith-righteousness.⁵⁹ Even in rejecting the meritorious view of the Scholastics, he recognized that in its idea of a treasury of merit, the Roman Catholic Church distorted the doctrine of satisfaction in justification:

⁵⁷ Calvin does not draw the distinction between the *synthetic* and *analytic* view of justification. It is significant to note that assurance of salvation is one of Calvin's major concerns in his theology. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.15-32. In the *Institutes*, Calvin describes the importance of *sola fide* in the doctrine of justification. In book III, chapter 2 of the *Institutes*, Calvin attacks the Roman Catholic doctrine of faith by arguing: "For faith consists in the knowledge of God and Christ (John 17:3), not in reverence for the church." Calvin revives Luther's doctrine of *sola scriptura* by claiming that "faith rests on God's word." Ibid., 3.2.3-6. In book III, chapter 11 of the *Institutes*, Calvin turns to the subject of justification.

⁵⁸ R.C. Sproul notes that in an analytical view of justification "nothing is added in the predicate that is already inherent in the subject"; on the other hand, a synthetic view "adds information in the predicate that is not inherent in the subject." In other words, the analytical view finds the source of righteousness inside of us, not outside of us (*extra nos*). But in the synthetic view, the imputed righteousness of Christ must be *added* to us for forensic justification. R. C. Sproul, *Faith Alone* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 108-9; Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 14-18.

⁵⁹ Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.10.4. For Calvin, God is the source of "all righteousness." Ibid., 2.17.3.

The merits of Christ and the holy apostles and martyrs our opponents call the “treasury of the church.”... Now these, to describe them rightly, are a profanation of the blood of Christ, a Satanic mockery, to lead the Christian people away from God’s grace, away from the life that is in Christ, and turn them aside from the true way of salvation. For how could that be sufficient for the forgiveness of sins, for reconciliation, for satisfaction—unless the lack of it, as of something dried up and exhausted, be otherwise supplied and filled?... Indulgences bestow forgiveness of sins through Peter, Paul, and the martyrs.⁶⁰

Calvin’s claim that Christ’s merit is sufficient in salvation fitted in well with Luther’s doctrine of justification. When Luther spoke of the “true treasure of the church” in the *95 Theses*, he attacked the Roman Catholic doctrine of supererogatory works.⁶¹ In expounding the error of the doctrine of supererogatory works, the Reformers claimed that the pope had no right to forgive sins through the blood of martyrs.⁶² Unlike the Reformers, the Catholic theologians believed that the martyrs or saints could earn *extra merit* from God through *works of supererogation*, for their works could achieve more merit than the standard of God’s requirements.⁶³ But Calvin argued that in this system the sufficiency of Christ’s merit in salvation is severely weakened. In his writings, he emphasized the necessity of God’s grace and the sufficiency of Christ’s merit. For example, in the *Institutes* it was made clear that the soul in its fallen state can approach God only by grace:

Hence it appears that God’s grace, as this word is understood in discussing regeneration, is the rule of the Spirit to direct and regulate man’s will. The Spirit

⁶⁰ Ibid., 3.5.2.

⁶¹ *Theses* 62. Lull, *Luther*, 27; Sproul, *Faith*, 58, 61. The Scholastic idea of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) is closely related to the idea of works of supererogation.

⁶² *Theses* 6. Lull, *Luther*, 22. Calvin rightly states: “In order, therefore, that this great good should not be superfluous, they mingle their blood with the blood of Christ; and out of the blood of both, the treasury of the church is fabricated for the forgiveness and satisfaction of sins.” Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.5.3; Calvin, *Necessity*, 42-43.

⁶³ R. C. Sproul, *Faith Alone: The Evangelical Doctrine of Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 142-44.

cannot regulate without correcting, without reforming, without renewing. For this reason we say that the beginning of our regeneration is to wipe out what is ours.... Hence we are right in saying that all the actions that arise from grace are wholly his.... Therefore we must keep in mind what we have elsewhere cited from Augustine: in vain, people busy themselves with finding any good of man's own in his will. For any mixture of the power of free will that men strive to mingle with God's grace is nothing but a corruption of grace.⁶⁴

Insisting that the human will plays a *passive* role in salvation, Calvin consistently cautions against Scholasticism.⁶⁵ As Calvin concedes that faith is itself a work of the Holy Spirit, so it is God who prepares the will of human beings so that they can proceed to make a choice in salvation by faith.⁶⁶ In Calvin's doctrine of justification, there is no room for works-righteousness. Calvin is reluctant to accept the Scholastic idea of human merit in salvation, which undermines the doctrine of justification.⁶⁷ The chief ground of Scholastic misunderstanding is the claim that man is justified by faith and works. To add anything to *sola fide* has a devastating effect on the doctrine of justification. Calvin

⁶⁴ Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.5.15. Calvin elaborates on the idea of *sola gratia* by rejecting the efficaciousness of human merit in justification: "From this relation it is clear that those who are justified by faith are justified apart from the merit of works—in fact, without the merit of works." Ibid., 3.11.18. In his *Institutes*, Calvin's idea of faith clearly shows the necessity of God's grace in salvation. His idea of *sola gratia* also includes justification in the Old Testament. Ibid., 3.2.28, 2.10.4.

⁶⁵ John Calvin, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will*, trans. G. I. Davies (Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1996), 213 [italics added]. Calvin's *Bondage* of 1552 strongly shows the relationship between divine grace and free will. It shows that Christ's righteousness is necessary by presenting the doctrine of original sin: "For we do not locate the origin of our wickedness in creation or in the work of God, but in the fault of our first ancestor." Ibid., 172-73. Also, in *The Necessity*, Calvin rightly raises the doctrine of original sin with which people finally compromise the grace of Christ in salvation (p. 39). For Calvin, the soul has two parts: the mind and the will. "The function of the mind is to go before the will and guide it." Calvin, *Necessity*, 77.

⁶⁶ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.4, 2.3.6. With respect to *sola gratia* in salvation, Calvin expounds the word "drawn" in the crucial passage on salvation, John 6:44. Calvin, *Bondage*, 232-33. Luther and Calvin show that human beings are justified *sola fide* and *sola gratia*. Pelagians think that God's grace comes by moral change. But Calvin agrees with Paul in Romans 4:16: "For by this expression Paul confirms this truth, that as long as men depend on works, they are harassed with doubts; for they deprive themselves of what the promises contain." John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 173.

admits that faith looks only to Christ who is our *only* righteousness.⁶⁸ The Scholastics, in Calvin's thought, tend to conclude that human beings can earn salvation through their obedience, as though they can obtain God's righteousness through faith and works beyond Christ's merits:

For the teaching of the Schoolmen, that love is prior to faith and hope, is mere madness; for it is faith alone that first engenders love in us. How much more rightly Bernard states: "I believe that the testimony of the conscience, which Paul calls 'the glory of the pious,' [II Cor. 1:12] consists of three things. First of all, it is necessary to believe that you cannot have forgiveness of sins apart from God's mercy. Second, you can have no good works at all unless he gives it. Finally, you cannot merit eternal life by any works unless that is also given free."⁶⁹

Thus, it would be a great mistake to accept the notion of works-righteousness in justification.⁷⁰ In Calvin's theology, faith is perfect enough to equip us with righteousness by connecting us with the perfect sacrifice of Christ.⁷¹ Calvin is emphatic that if faith equals the action of love, then Christ's righteousness is unnecessary in justification. Without hesitation, Calvin says that God freely forgives our sins and freely gives us faith.

⁶⁷ Calvin calls our attention to a dangerous element in the Scholastic doctrine of faith, which changes God's grace into only moral suasion in suggesting that we can be justified by natural abilities. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.38; Calvin, *Romans*, 173.

⁶⁸ Calvin clearly thinks that Christ is the object of faith. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.1. Cf. B. A. Gerrish, "John Calvin," in *Reformers in Profile*, ed. B. A. Gerrish (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 156-59. *Institutes*, 3.11.14. When God "touches" people with his sense of "goodness," they recognize their reconciliation with God by *sola fide—sola gratia*. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.16, 3.11.19.

⁶⁹ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.41. Cf. 3.11.20. Calvin believes that Christ the Justifier cannot be separated from Christ the Sanctifier. For Calvin, a Christian who lives by faith after being *reckoned* as righteous by God will show the evidence of his sanctification. This is James' teaching in Calvin's theology: faith is justified by works. However, human works are not the ground of justification, only the *imputed* righteousness of Christ. For Calvin's interpretation of James 2:14-26, see John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of James* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 309-17; G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 131-39. For the relationship between faith and love, see Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.8.53, 3.2.41, 3.18.8.

⁷⁰ Calvin rejects the notion that justifying faith "acts through love," for that supports the idea of works-righteousness in salvation. *Ibid.*, 3.11.14.

⁷¹ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.23. Calvin clearly follows Luther in setting forth the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

In this connection, the unwilling heart by God's grace becomes the willing heart to come to him. It is clear, then, that to Calvin the will's direction is changed by God's *irresistible* grace. Calvin also seems to conclude that grace is the efficient cause of salvation.⁷² Why does Calvin stress God's grace in the doctrine of justification? Calvin's doctrine of original sin discloses the necessity of God's mercy in salvation. This brings us to the important point that for Calvin the idea of God's grace in salvation makes it easier to explain the necessity of Christ's sacrifice for our sins.⁷³ This doctrine of grace is clearly of significance in relation to Calvin's attempt to construct the doctrine of atonement on the basis of Christ's sacrifice for our sins.

How does the vicarious sacrifice of Christ become effective for us? Calvin's doctrine of atonement is closely connected to the role of faith in the doctrine of justification. Within this relationship between the vicarious work of Christ and faith, Calvin appears to prove that faith plays an important role in justification. What is the nature of faith? Calvin's doctrine of faith bears a remarkable resemblance to the position carefully established by Luther. The idea of *sola fide* does not appeal to works-

⁷² Ibid., 3.14.17. In his *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, Calvin interprets Romans 3:24 to show that God's mercy is the primary cause of salvation, from the beginning to the end of the Christian life. In commenting on Romans, Calvin emphasizes the centrality of justification by faith alone in Christianity. Calvin, *Romans*, 141.

⁷³ In Calvin's doctrine of atonement, there are two elements of Christ's satisfaction through his obedience: propitiation and expiation. For the first element, Christ as the once-for-all sacrifice satisfies the demands of the law by offering himself. Second, expiation has to do with removing sins from us. Calvin is attacking the Pelagian view in his doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sins to his posterity. Calvin, *Romans*, 201. See also Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.12.3, 2.14.3, 2.17.4.

There is no doubt that in his *Romans* Calvin consistently insists on the necessity of God's grace in salvation. For Calvin, it is important to recognize that God initiates the gift of salvation, not human meritorious works. In his *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, Calvin again underscores the same idea in Galatians 3:6 that people are justified *sola fide—sola gratia*: "We are 'justified freely by his grace.' (Rom. iii. 24) Christ is our righteousness. The mercy of God is the cause of our righteousness.... We obtain righteousness by faith." John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 85. See also Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.3.2.

righteousness in Calvin's thought. Rather, it appeals to the necessity of God's mercy—it helps us move our eyes from human merit to God's grace.⁷⁴ Calvin, like Luther, believes that faith is nothing but an "empty vessel," for faith plays an *instrumental* role in justification.⁷⁵ Calvin demonstrates that it is possible to be justified before God only by the *instrument* of faith and *only through Christ*:

God alone justifies; then we transfer this same function to Christ because he was given to us for righteousness. We compare faith to a kind of vessel; for unless we come empty and with the mouth of our soul open to seek Christ's grace, we are not capable of receiving Christ. From this it is to be inferred that, in teaching that before his righteousness is received Christ is received in faith, we do not take the power of justifying away from Christ.... For the reasoning is similar: namely, that faith, even though of itself it is of no worth or price, can justify us by bringing Christ, just as a pot crammed with money makes a man rich. Therefore, I say that faith, which is only the instrument for receiving righteousness, is ignorantly confused with Christ, who is the material cause and at the same time the Author and Minister of this great benefit.⁷⁶

The use of the term *instrument* is significant, in that it is the term also used by Calvin in his *Galatians* and *Ephesians* to describe the *emptiness* of faith in the imputation of Christ's righteousness.⁷⁷ This idea of faith as the *instrument* of justification raises an

⁷⁴ For Calvin, faith is given by God. Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.5.7.

⁷⁵ Rom 3:22, "This righteousness from God comes through [δία with genitive] faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe." People are justified by, through, from, and according to faith, but never because of (δία with accusative) faith. Cf. Gal. 3:6; Jam. 2:23; Rom. 4:3. John Murray supports Calvin's view of faith: "Justification is never said to be *dia pistin* (on account of faith)." John Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 2 (Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977), 217; John Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955; reprint, 1992), 125, 128.

⁷⁶ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.7. In *Institutes*, Calvin speaks of the importance of God's word in relation to the nature of faith. Ibid., 3.2.6, 3.2.29-31, 3.2.33-4, 3.2.38. For Calvin, the Holy Spirit makes the word of God "efficacious for our faith." Ibid., 3.2.33. He also notes that "faith rests upon the knowledge of Christ." Ibid., 3.2.8. On this basis, he declares: "When we say that faith must rest upon a freely given promise, we do not deny that believers embrace and grasp the Word of God in every respect: but we point out the promise of mercy as the proper goal of faith." Ibid., 3.2.29. It is important to notice that when Calvin claims that faith "begins with the promise, rests in it, and ends in it," he refers to "sincere faith in a true object, in true content, not a sincere faith in false content." Ibid., 3.2.29; Sproul, *Faith*, 76.

important point. With the notion of the *instrument* of faith, Calvin, like Luther, links union and imputation on the basis of Christ's righteousness in the doctrine of justification.⁷⁸ Calvin understands that human beings are not made righteous, but are *reckoned* as righteous by faith.

To sum up, it is clear that no other theologians in the sixteenth century stress more than Luther and Calvin the belief that by faith alone human beings are justified through the imputation of Christ's righteousness. That is, God declares us to be *just* on the basis of Christ's righteousness. The Reformers describe this view as *sola fide–sola gratia*. They truly help us to glorify God in the doctrine of justification, for their idea of *sola fide–sola gratia* stresses nothing other than God's grace in justification. Thus, they believe that Christ's *alien* righteousness is necessary for the wicked to be justified.

Post-Reformation Theology: The Rise of Moralism

During the Reformation, the Roman Catholic Church led the "Counter-Reformation," which managed to renew Roman Catholicism and save her from the Protestant threat.⁷⁹ Through the Counter-Reformation, Roman Catholic teachings

⁷⁷ Calvin makes it clear that faith is the *instrument* of justification in *Galatians*: "All merit of works is thus excluded from being the cause of justification, when the whole is ascribed to faith." Calvin, *Galatians*, 85. Calvin comments on Ephesians 2:8 that faith brings *emptiness* to God, so that people may be "filled with the blessings of Christ." John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 227. It is clear, then, that on the basis of the instrument of faith, Calvin attempts to describe the emptiness of faith, that "faith looks away from itself to Christ." Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 175.

⁷⁸ We will discuss union with Christ and imputation in the next section, "C. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness."

⁷⁹ Spitz, 476-78. The Roman Catholic Church had become very corrupt with the papacy functioning as a supreme authority, and the Church accepted institutional reforms. Also, the Society of Jesus—the "shock troops" of the Counterreformation—placed a significant emphasis on education and missions, which turned out to be successful. *Ibid.*, 478-83.

penetrated to the common people in the seventeenth century. In view of the Protestant threat in the sixteenth century, there was a strong demand in the Roman Catholic Church to hold a council to reform the Church. This demand was met by the Council of Trent (1546). That council became the defining moment for the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification at the end of the Middle Ages. An important problem, however, emerged at this council. Instead of presupposing God's grace in justification, they presupposed the transformational aspect of justification in denying the Reformation idea of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.⁸⁰

In What the Justification of the Sinner Consists, and What Are Its Causes. This disposition or preparation is followed by justification itself, which is not only a remission of sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts whereby an unjust man becomes just and from being an enemy becomes a friend, that he may be an heir according to hope of life everlasting (Titus 3:7).⁸¹

After the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic Church still believed that human beings were saved by the infusion of Christ's righteousness, which created an actual change in them.⁸² Although some Augustinians in Roman Catholic circles recognized that human beings were saved by grace alone, most Roman Catholic theologians never accepted the Reformation view of justification by faith alone.⁸³ On this analytical view of justification, the Counter-Reformation tended to consist of moral reform. In the late

⁸⁰ McGrath clearly shows that the Tridentine decree basically opposed the Protestant doctrine of justification. McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 80-86.

⁸¹ Mark A. Noll, ed., *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1997), 176 [italics not added]. The Tridentine decree claims that baptism is the instrumental cause of justification. *Ibid.*, 177.

⁸² Spitz, 483-91.

⁸³ On the basis of the actual change made by grace alone in their analytical view of justification, people could stand in the judgment of God. McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 68-80; Sproul, *Willing*, 80-81.

sixteenth century, Roman Catholic theologians remained convinced that the sacraments were the instruments by which God infused grace, and they thought that the infusion of grace could save human beings.

In the seventeenth century, the Protestant Church faced internal problems in the conflict with Arminianism and Amyraldianism. James Arminius (1559-1609) put pressure on the Reformed Church with his semi-Pelagian doctrine of salvation. To Arminius, divine grace was a *necessary* condition, but not a *sufficient* condition for salvation. More specifically, Arminius held that God's *prevenient* grace made human beings able to cooperate with the divine will in salvation.⁸⁴ Thus, justification included the notion of the natural power of the human will in Arminius's theology. He insisted that God's grace actually helps human beings assent to God's calling in salvation, while Luther and Calvin maintained that people could not resist the grace of God in salvation. In Arminius's view, God's grace turned out to be *resistible* by the human will.

Like James Arminius, the Remonstrants accepted the doctrines of God's resistible grace in salvation and universal atonement.⁸⁵ The problem of Arminianism caused the Reformed churches in Europe to assemble at the Synod of Dort (1618-1619). Against Arminianism, the Canons of Dort taught the doctrines of predestination and the sufficient sacrifice of Christ for salvation. When the Canons stressed that through the work of the Holy Spirit God accomplishes the gospel calling with the illumination of God's Word, they strongly demonstrated the exclusiveness of grace in salvation. But they

⁸⁴ Sproul, *Willing*, 130-33. Sproul shows clearly that Arminius had the synergistic view of justification.

⁸⁵ Walker, 541-42.

did not clearly show the doctrine of justification by faith alone.⁸⁶ The Arminian doctrine of faith made salvation *conditional* on the human act of faith:

The Synod rejects the errors of those who teach God's good pleasure and purpose, which Scripture mentions in its teaching of election, does not involve God's choosing certain particular people rather than others, but involves God's choosing, out of all possible conditions (including of the works of the law) or out of the whole order of things, the intrinsically unworthy act of faith, as well as the imperfect obedience of faith, to be a condition of salvation; and it involves his graciously wishing to count this as perfect obedience and to look upon it as worthy of the reward of eternal life.⁸⁷

The Synod of Dort successfully defined Reformed theology for centuries to come. In the French Reformed Church, however, Amyraldianism began to grow in the School of Saumur. Moses Amyraldus (1596-1664), who was a student of John Cameron (1579-1625), introduced the idea of "*hypothetical universalism* of grace." Amyraldianism is called "four-point Calvinism" or "hypothetical universalism," for it rejects the doctrine of limited atonement.⁸⁸ For Amyraldus, "the will always follows the intellect, that the irresistible working of God upon the will of man is effected through the illumination of the intellect."⁸⁹ Changing the nature of the atonement, Amyraldism was inclined to weaken the Reformed doctrine of salvation and to open the door to Arminianism by their

⁸⁶ Seeberg, 420-24; Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 46-47.

⁸⁷ "The Canons of Dort," in *Ecumenical Creeds and Reformed Confessions* (Grand Rapids: CRC Publications, 1988), 127.

⁸⁸ In this dissertation, the notion of limited atonement is by no means related to the scope of the divine election. But rather it is relevant either to the notion of *solar gratia* or that of the inability of human beings after the Fall. For Calvin, faith is the essence of assurance. And true faith consists in "the knowledge of God," which is the word of God. Only through the Holy Spirit, the word of God "seals" upon the heart of the wicked in Calvin's theology. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace* (Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1994), 139; Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.7. And justification has its basis on the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ. Therefore, *sola gratia*, *sola Scriptura*, *sola fide* and *solus Christus* are closely linked in Calvin's doctrine of justification. We will deal with the limited atonement more in the next chapter.

⁸⁹ Amyraldus makes the process of salvation "psychologically more intelligible." Seeberg, 425.

“conditional substitution” theory.⁹⁰ The Amyraldian doctrine of atonement was rejected by the Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) in affirming the mediatorial work of Christ:

The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him. (Chap. VIII, sec. V)⁹¹

While the Protestant Church was being distracted by those internal problems with Arminians and Amyraldians, there was a *primitive purity* movement during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603) in England.⁹² The English Puritans sought for a more genuine *purity* in worship, adopting the Calvinistic notion that worshipers must follow *only* what God *ordains* in Scripture.⁹³ Horton Davis comments that the Puritans accepted

⁹⁰ The Amyraldian doctrine of atonement eventually destroys “the whole substance of the atonement” as well as “the whole substance of regeneration.” B. B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation* (Boonton, NJ: Simpson Publishing Co., 1989), 94-100.

⁹¹ See A. A. Hodge, *The Confession of Faith* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1992), 148. Also, the Amyraldian idea of universal grace was rejected by this Confession (chap. VIII, sec. VIII). *Ibid.*, 153. Cf. John Murray, “The Theology of the Westminster Confession,” in *Scripture and Confession: A Book about Confessions Old and New*, ed. John H. Skilton (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 139-41.

⁹² Queen Elizabeth wanted to reform the Church of England in theology, but not to change its external forms of worship. The Church of England was basically Reformed in theology, but the Puritans believed that reform needed to extend also to worship. Walker, 543-60; I. Breward, “Puritan Theology,” in *New Dictionary of Theology*.

⁹³ Horton Davis, *The Worship of the English Puritans* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1997), 12-16. Davis draws our attention to the influence of Reformation theology in the liturgical reformation of the English Puritans: “It was, therefore, the declared aim of both Reformers [Luther and Calvin] to restore the worship of the ancient Church.... If men were justified by their faith in the righteousness of Christ, accepting his sacrifice as the all-sufficient guarantee for the pardon of their sins, then all practices motivated by a belief in justification by works had to disappear. Such practices included attending the Mass as a good work and going on religious pilgrimage.... The very concept of the efficacy of the intercession of the saints and of the necessary mediation of the priesthood, nullified the Biblical doctrine of Christ as the sole Mediator.” *Ibid.*, 15. Davis recognizes that the idea of *sola scriptura* is the foundation of the doctrines of justification and the atonement of Christ. *Ibid.*

Calvin's doctrines of Scripture and original sin.⁹⁴ In the seventeenth century, Thomas Brooks, as a representative English Puritan in soteriology, sought to provide an answer to the problem of assurance in his book *Heaven on Earth*, at a time when many people struggled with assurance.⁹⁵ Brooks said that assurance could be found in the "exercise and actings of grace" through obedience.⁹⁶ Thus, Brooks made a key distinction between faith and assurance in salvation. It is important to note that for Calvin, all believers have assurance, but Brooks thought that not all believers could have assurance. In other words, it was *possible* for believers to have assurance, but not all of them did. For Brooks, many people either have *little* assurance of salvation or do not have "well-grounded assurance."⁹⁷ Preparatory work was necessary to achieve assurance:

Waiting souls, remember this assurance is yours, but the time of giving it is the Lord's; the jewel is yours, but the season in which he will give it is in his own hand; the gold chain is yours, but he only knows the hour wherein he will put it about your necks.⁹⁸

It is important to note that when Calvin talks about assurance, he does not mean that you have to wait until God provides assurance to find out whether you are saved. Assurance is one of Calvin's prime concerns in *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. The believer must have assurance, for assurance is the essence of faith in Calvin's theology.⁹⁹ Thus, Calvin would say that doubting the reliability of God's promise is no

⁹⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁹⁵ Thomas Brooks, *Heaven on Earth* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1982). Unlike the Reformers, he linked neither faith to union with Christ, nor the imputation of Christ's righteousness to faith.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 150-51.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 16-32.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 64.

virtue because believers would not doubt the reliability of God's promise, since they have faith in Christ. Brooks is a good example of the problem of assurance in seventeenth-century England, for his teachings are typical of the problem of assurance in the Puritans, who tended to separate faith from assurance.¹⁰⁰ The Puritan argument on preparatory work, as we have seen, ends up by fundamentally changing the message of the gospel, for it tries to establish the steps to be pursued in experience. In relation to the English Puritan's concept of justification, Alister McGrath recognizes that preparationism in New England Puritanism underlies the idea of assurance:

The controversy over 'the heart prepared' is of importance in a number of respects, particularly as it indicates the manner in which Puritan thinking on justification and assurance are related. Although Hooker and Cotton adopt very different theologies of justification (the former asserting the activity, the latter the passivity, of man prior to his justification), they share a common desire to establish the grounds of assurance within the context of that theology. It is therefore of importance to note that the grounds of assurance are the consequence of a prior understanding of the mode in which man is justified.¹⁰¹

In developing their doctrine of justification, the English divines in the seventeenth century were primarily concerned with the formal cause of justification. They discerned three formal causes of justification: the infusion of inherent

⁹⁹ When discussing the nature of assurance, Calvin concludes that "the knowledge of faith consists in assurance rather than in comprehension." Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.14. As he says in one place, assurance "alone nourishes and protects faith." Ibid., 3.2.37. Thus, "to have faith is to strengthen the mind with constant assurance and perfect confidence." Ibid., 3.13.3. Cf. 3.2.15, 3.2.16, 3.2.21, 3.2.22, 3.2.36, 3.2.38; McGrath, *Justification*, 53.

¹⁰⁰ The Puritan theologians began to think of the stages which one could go through in preparation for salvation. "What else can I do to prepare to get saved?" In the preparatory work of the gospel, people could legitimately seek to wait for saving grace by the *exercise* of religious means. McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 117-19. Cf. Robert W. Jenson, *America's Theologian: A Recommendation of Jonathan Edwards* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 54-60.

¹⁰¹ McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 119. New England Puritanism became powerless in the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Ibid.

righteousness, the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and the imputation of faith.¹⁰²

However, there was a dangerous tendency for people to fall into moralism as their teachers emphasized sanctification in misinterpreting the foundation of justification.¹⁰³ C.

F. Allison provides an excellent analysis of the problem of moralism in the Anglican Church from the seventeenth century to the eighteenth century:

Whatever the causes, the seventeenth century bequeathed to the eighteenth century in England a soteriology which hopelessly alienated ethics and moral theology from their foundations in theological doctrine. What had been the typical synthesis of Anglican theology came to have no effective champion, and exegesis of the Gospel within the burgeoning moralism that afflicted the end of the century was full of awkward and debilitating consequences.¹⁰⁴

This moralistic tendency and the failure to understand the foundation of justification resulted in loosening the root of Christian morality in England. Moralism can grow in every age if people put too much emphasis on the role of the human will in justification and compromise God's grace. This moralistic pattern reappeared in New England Theology during nineteenth-century America. Jonathan Edwards, however, was the key figure in New England Theology, and moralism was not part of his doctrine of justification.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² C. F. Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York: Seabury Press, 1966), 200-202.

¹⁰³ In *The Rise of Moralism*, Allison clearly shows the danger of moralism in soteriology. Cf. McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 105-34.

¹⁰⁴ Allison, 205-206.

¹⁰⁵ The doctrine of justification in Jonathan Edwards will be discussed in the following chapter.

C. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Reformation Theology

In the preceding section, we discussed how the concept of fallen humanity, including free will and faith, affects theological perspectives on justification. Since the fundamental relationship between God and human beings has been changed by the Fall, one can maintain a distinctively Reformation doctrine of faith while agreeing substantially with the Reformers' view of the effects of original sin. In this section, we will deal with the views of the Reformers, mainly Luther and Calvin, regarding the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.¹⁰⁶ These background sections are necessary in order to understand the Reformation doctrine of justification and imputation, and to provide a helpful viewpoint for analyzing the six revivalists in chapters 4 and 5.

Martin Luther (1483-1546)

The discussion of imputation will prepare us to look at the doctrine of imputation in the Reformers and the six revivalists in this study. The word "imputation" must be adequately treated, for it might misrepresent the notion of the involvement of humanity in the first sin of Adam. In what follows in this study, we may helpfully define "to be imputed" as "to be reckoned."¹⁰⁷ It means simply that Adam's sin is "reckoned by God as our sin."¹⁰⁸ Adam's posterity, however, is not reckoned "as potentially but as actually one

¹⁰⁶ In order for us to complete our analysis of the doctrine of imputation, we should look at their response to the views of others, seeking to understand the Reformation doctrine of imputation before we examine the six revivalists in chapters 4 and 5. However, the fact that some background matters in the doctrines of justification and imputation are deeply interdependent and correlated with each other shows that in order to discuss the doctrine of imputation it is sometimes necessary to revisit some background issues that were explored in previous sections, such as the concepts of grace and faith.

¹⁰⁷ John Murray claims that Romans 5:13 affirms the idea of imputation by saying, "If we say that the trespass of Adam is imputed to posterity, all we can strictly and properly be regarded as meaning is that the sin of Adam is reckoned by God as the sin also of posterity." Murray, *Imputation*, 72. He insists that the concept of imputation is shown in Lev. 17:4, Psalm 32:2, Rom. 4:8, II Cor. 5:19. Ibid., 71.

with Adam” in his first sin.¹⁰⁹ The question arises then, How can the sin of Adam be ours? Some theologians try to make the case that the imputation of Adam’s sin is *alien* guilt.¹¹⁰ As Berkouwer indicates in *Sin*, many theologians try to solve the problem of a *peccatum alienum* or *alien* guilt. In this study, we do not intend to fully examine this controversy, since it must be dealt with in connection with a number of matters. For now, we shall briefly discuss the major issue of the controversy, what is called “a certain connection” or “a certain relation” between Adam’s first sin and his posterity in realism and federalism.

Realists such as W. G. Shed claim that human beings are “co-sinners” with Adam.¹¹¹ They see guilt as “an actual and real co-sinning.”¹¹² Federalists disagree with them on the idea of pre-existence implied in their notion of co-sinning with Adam. Murray denies that Adam’s descendants did “personally and voluntarily as individuals eat of the forbidden fruit.”¹¹³ Certainly, he defends that the *involvement* in Adam’s first sin should not be considered the “*transfer*” from the “moral character” in Adam’s sin to his posterity.¹¹⁴ Murray’s points on the *involvement* in Adam’s sin show that it is Adam’s sin

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 72. It also means “to be counted” or “to be transferred” in this study.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 90.

¹¹⁰ Berkouwer, *Sin*, 424-35. In the chapter 12 of *Sin*, Berkouwer attempts to show the controversy of *peccatum alienum* and *peccatum proprium* (one’s own guilt). He then argues that the problem of *alien* guilt brings us back the “revival of Pelagius,” that is to say, the “essential goodness of man.” Ibid., 428-30.

¹¹¹ This analysis comes from Berkouwer and Murray. Ibid., 438-41; Murray, *Imputation*, 24-36. It also can be called “seminal union.” Murray, *Imputation*, 26.

¹¹² Berkouwer, *Sin*, 439. Berkouwer presents the view of realists by using Ezekiel 18, Hebrews 8 and Romans 5:12-19. Generally speaking, their view may be understood as “an actual and a physical reality or a reality that was *genuinely* present” in Adam’s first sin. Ibid., 442.

¹¹³ Murray, *Imputation*, 86.

“in a manner that is not ours.”¹¹⁵ It is important for this present study to note that federalists regard Adam as *representative* headship in terms of “God’s ordinance.”¹¹⁶ They surely recognize that we become *sinful* not because of the imputation of Adam’s sin but “because of our solidarity with Adam” in his first sin, since the imputation is not considered “something antecedent” to the human depravity.¹¹⁷ As Berkouwer rightly points out, although both the realists and the federalists do not fully answer to the concept of *alien* guilt, their motive is very “valid,” for they try to defend “a real imputation of man’s guilt.”¹¹⁸

In *Imputation*, Murray develops his representative “analogy” with “the two fold headship of the two Adams (Christ: the last Adam)” in 1 Corinthians 15:22 and 45-49 in terms of God’s “constitutive” ordination.¹¹⁹ By divine institution (“God’s foreordained design”), the relation between Adam and his posterity is “after the pattern” of the relation between Christ and his people, and the analogy between the two headships shows contrast and similarity.¹²⁰ In *Sin*, Berkouwer’s analysis on realism and federalism is very

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 36-9; Berkouwer, *Sin*, 450-1, 457, 459, 465. According to Murray, this representative view does not deny the “natural headship of Adam, the seminal union” of Adam and his posterity. Murray, *Imputation*, 37-8.

¹¹⁷ Murray, *Imputation*, 92. Adam’s sin is both “*peccatum alienum* and *peccatum proprium*.” Ibid., 86. For both Reformed and Lutheran theologians, “*reatus poenae* (liability to punishment) presupposes *culpa*.” And *culpa* is clearly shown in “solidaric” depravity. Ibid., 95.

¹¹⁸ Berkouwer, *Sin*, 448, 457.

¹¹⁹ Murray, *Imputation*, 39-41. There is a legitimate scriptural point here. In Scripture such as 1 Corinthians 15:22 and 45-49, and Romans 5:12-19, Adam is the *type* of Christ. Ibid., 40-41, 85-89. We will discuss the idea of “constituted” sinners or “constituted” righteous in Romans 5:19 in the next chapter.

helpful, for he denies the notion of *alien* guilt in the imputation of Adam's sin and rightly concludes that when the problem is properly understood, we can see the area of "riddle" in the reality of guilt in human beings.¹²¹ How then do we respond to the doctrine of imputation in the Reformers and the six revivalists in this study? Obviously, Berkouwer concludes in *Sin* that the correlation between the solidarity with Adam's sin and the necessity of God's grace (God's forgiveness) is an absolute truth.¹²² Therefore, perhaps to understand their views on imputation better, we should explore their teachings in terms of a "certain connection" or a "certain relation" that appears to be the case of realism or federalism.¹²³

At the beginning to examine Luther's teachings in this connection, it is important for us to recall that Luther comes to believe that *through faith alone by Christ alone* God

¹²⁰ Ibid., 39, 92. The contrast between the two headships comes from its *scope*: the *scope* of sin and the *scope* of righteousness. In Murray's term, the contrast between the "reign" of sin and the "reign" of righteousness. Ibid., 40. In *Sin*, Berkouwer points out only a dissimilarity between the imputation of Adam's sin and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Berkouwer, *Sin*, 453. In the chapters 13 and 14 of *Sin*, he shows a difference between "realism" and "federalism." Ibid., 436-65.

¹²¹ In *Sin*, Berkouwer asks important questions to the doctrine of original sin: "Has the Church spoken of an 'alien guilt' or the guilt of 'someone else,' as a solution to the problem of *my guilt*? Does original sin suggest an 'alien guilt' to which *my guilt is added*?" Ibid., 429 (italics not added). Berkouwer is troubled that federalism does not settle these questions with their notion of solidarity and might weaken the reality of man's guilt, because he believes that original sin "goes beyond all mere solidarity and cannot be explained in terms of 'solidarity' alone." Ibid., 426. See also *ibid.*, 448-65. He denies that sin can be "explainable" or "analyzed" with human reason: "Therefore when the grace of Christ reveals the true meaning of our lives in a love for God and our neighbors, the riddle of sin is not resolved but is *only known and confessed*." Ibid., 146 (italics not added); see also *ibid.* 136, 144. In this book, Berkouwer evidently presents a theological problem and then tries to solve the nature of original sin, but he concludes that the reality of the *guilt* of human beings is *riddle* in connection with God's grace: "We see that guilt as the *riddle* of man's sin, which can only remain a *riddle* when we observe the guilt of man in terms of the goodness and graciousness of God." Ibid., 537 (italics added); *ibid.*, 445, 464. Since Berkouwer's discussion of sin confirms that conclusion, we must choose a theological perspective to look at the views of the Reformers and the six revivalists in this study.

¹²² Ibid., 537-45.

¹²³ Berkouwer might think it is best to go beyond both realism and federalism. It is interesting that he still sees the necessity of solidarity of guilt in his *Sin*. Ibid., 517-43. He carries on his arguments as if

justifies us apart from all the works of the law.¹²⁴ Finding that faith alone justifies, but *only* through the work of the Holy Spirit, Luther makes it clear that Christian righteousness comes from God *only*.¹²⁵ Why does Luther emphasize the exclusiveness of God's grace in the doctrine of justification? Why do we need *alien* righteousness? How do we receive Christ's righteousness from God?

In *Galatians*, Luther explains why imputation is necessary in justification. *Galatians* embraces a number of important elements in Luther's concept of the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ. For example, it shows the necessity of Christ's righteousness in connection with the imputation of Adam's sin to us.¹²⁶ And there is no remission of sins without faith.¹²⁷ This is completely in line with Paul's understanding of the gospel. Second, Luther goes on to say that the great blessings of the gospel come to

there is no other way to deny the reality the *guilt* of man. Ibid., 537-40. Berkouwer rejects *fatalism* in this connection. Ibid., 539-43.

¹²⁴ What Luther aimed to rebuild through the doctrine of justification was the stronghold of the gospel: without imputation we do not have *sola fide*, and we do not have the gospel. For example, in *Galatians*, Luther's *sola fide* points us away from ourselves to God and his grace to lay the foundation for the imputation of Christ's righteousness: "Faith, therefore, is a certain steadfast beholding, which looks upon Christ alone, the conqueror of sin and death and the giver of righteousness, salvation, and eternal life. This is the cause why Paul names and sets forth Jesus Christ so often in his epistles." Luther, *Galatians*, 232. It is crucial to understand that Luther completely rules out the thought of faith as a meritorious work in justification. And it has to do with what is *extra nos*, with the imputation of what Christ does for our righteousness. Althaus, 224-42.

¹²⁵ Luther, *Galatians*, 129-32, 243, 257. For Luther, faith is a gift of God, as he states, "The knowledge of Christ and of faith is no work of man, but simply the gift of God, who as He creates faith, so He keeps us in it." Ibid., 55. For faith, see *ibid.*, 55-56, 67, 87, 107, 116, 129, 149-50, 163, 174-75 (without charity), 218, 226 (assured confidence), 232 (upon Christ alone), 243, 257.

¹²⁶ Luther's doctrine of the will clearly shows that reason cannot lead us to God. Human reason is afflicted with original sin. Luther elaborates Augustine's thesis that sin is grounded in the will. Luther, *Galatians*, 316. In relation to the law, Luther explains that human beings are unable to be justified and saved by the law. Ibid., 300

¹²⁷ Luther, *Galatians*, 95, 132. In Luther's theology, the human heart is "born in sin." Ibid., 250. Also, in *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther insists that "*man has 'free-will'*"—merely on the ground that God might grant His!" Luther, *Bondage*, 106. To Luther, only God has free will. That is to say, "in all that bears on salvation or damnation, he has no 'free-will,' but is a captive, prisoner and bondsman, either to the will of God, or to the will of Satan." Ibid., 107. Luther clearly turned from Aristotle to Augustine.

us, not by our personal merits, but by the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us. When Luther speaks of the necessity of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, he relates it to original sin:

This is therefore a strange and wonderful definition of Christian righteousness, that it is the imputation of God for righteousness, or unto righteousness, because of our faith in Christ, or for Christ's sake.... Now we can see how faith justifies without works, and yet how imputation of righteousness is also necessary. Sins remain in us, and God utterly hates sin. Therefore it is necessary that we should have imputation of righteousness, which we obtain through Christ and for Christ's sake, who is given to us and received of us by faith.¹²⁸

This statement suggests that because of Adam's sin, human beings are not able to obtain the gift of salvation. In addition to identifying the role of Adam's sin in justification, Luther describes two types of imputation: the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Luther often mentions the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants in his writings.¹²⁹ He connects it with the necessity of Christ's righteousness. Since there is an apparent connection between the imputation of Adam's sin and the imputation of Christ's righteousness,

¹²⁸ Luther, *Galatians*, 149-50. Luther emphasizes that there are two types of imputation. Because of the imputation of Adam's sin to us, everyone is a sinner, and without the work of the Holy Spirit no one can come to Jesus Christ: "For as we cannot deny that we are all sinners, and are constrained to say that through the sin of Adam we are all lost, were made the enemies of God, subject to the wrath and judgment of God, and guilty of eternal death; so can we not deny that Christ died for our sins, that He might make us righteous. For He died not to justify the righteous, but the unrighteous, and to make them the friends and children of God, and inheritors of all heavenly gifts." Ibid., 117.

¹²⁹ In *The Gospel of St. John*, Luther elucidates the imputation of Adam's sin: "Through Adam's disobedience and fall original sin was passed on to us, so that we also fell victim to sin and death and incurred God's anger, His damnation and eternal punishment." Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 22, *Sermons on the Gospel of St. John Chapters 1-4*, trans. Martin H. Bertram (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1957), 119. See also Luther, *Galatians*, 366, 117; *Luther's Works*, 10:298; *Luther's Works*, 22:19, 137-38; *Luther's Works*, 24:255-56; *Luther's Works*, 24:342; *Luther's Works*, 28:113; *Luther's Works*, 9:51; *Luther's Works*, 3:103; *Luther's Works*, 1:114, 141, 161, 169, 171-72, 196, 340.

Luther speaks of a double transfer between Christ and the believer in justification.¹³⁰

Through faith, this double transfer takes place by the help of the Holy Spirit:

For we are enemies of God, dead in sin, and accursed. What do we deserved then?... Wherefore there is no other way to avoid the curse, but to believe, and with assured confidence to say, Thou art my sin and my curse, or rather, I am Thy sin, Thy curse, Thy death, Thy wrath of God, Thy hell; and contrariwise, Thou art my righteousness, my blessing, my life, my grace of God, my heaven. Therefore, we are the cause that He was made a curse; no, rather we are His curse.¹³¹

It bears repeating that only by faith alone can Christ's righteousness be given to us. By this teaching, Luther is trying to point us to the free grace of God so that he can highlight the importance of *sola gratia* in justification.¹³² Another characteristic of Luther's concept of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is that it is God's gift. This "unspeakable gift" is the miracle of grace, which "excels all reason, that God accounts and acknowledges him for righteous, without works."¹³³ By using the passive voice, Luther makes it clear that God is doing the imputation of Christ's righteousness, after the Holy Spirit awakens faith in the wicked.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ The double transfer is the transfer of the believer's sin to Christ and the transfer of his righteousness to the believer. See Luther, *Galatians*, 95-96, 117, 146, 150, 156-57.

¹³¹ Ibid., 190. According to Luther, faith "embraces" Christ Jesus. Ibid., 116.

¹³² Berkouwer strongly defends the doctrine of *sola fide-sola gratia* in this sense. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 40-44. McGrath correctly points out that Luther's theology of justification is based on the theology of the crucified One. That means that the work of Jesus Christ is the ground of justification. McGrath, *Luther's Theology*, 113. For the theology of the cross, see also Althaus, 25-34.

¹³³ Luther, *Galatians*, 149. Luther opposes the Pelagian doctrine of man, that human nature remains sinless and every generation is born with the same ability with which Adam was created. Luther, however, adds further considerations: the imputation of original sin, a true faith, and a new will. More important for Luther is the idea of *sola gratia* in his statement. Luther also criticizes the Pelagian tendency of Scholasticism. For more of Luther's criticism of Scholasticism, see *ibid.*, 93, 148, 167-68, 182, 211, 252, 357.

¹³⁴ Luther, *Galatians*, 284.

What role does the Holy Spirit then play in the imputation of Christ's righteousness? To explain Luther's view of the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to salvation, it is appropriate to note that Luther sees rebirth as the work of the Holy Spirit. As the Holy Spirit comes into our heart, God creates a "new heart" in us, so that we can see our sinful nature.¹³⁵ Similarly, Luther speaks of the imputation of Christ's righteousness as God's "putting on Christ's righteousness."¹³⁶ Luther is comfortable with the image of putting on a robe as long as it is taken in the sense that the Holy Spirit drives us to put on Christ's righteousness. Also, it should be noted that there are times when Luther speaks of "being covered" with Christ's righteousness.¹³⁷ It is important to note that this is how Luther expresses the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Beyond what Augustine says about God's grace in salvation, Luther significantly sees God's righteousness as *iustitia aliena*, "an *alien* righteousness" that justifies us.¹³⁸ Luther distinguishes himself from Augustine with this vital notion of *alien* righteousness. This *alien* righteousness is the righteousness of Christ, which is not of us, but outside of us (*extra nos*): *iustitia extra nos*, "a righteousness outside of or apart from us." Luther can effectively denounce the Roman Catholic concept of merit by appealing to this *alien* righteousness. For Luther, God imputes Christ's righteousness to us in the gift of

¹³⁵ To Luther, after we are justified, God creates a "new heart" to persuade us. *Ibid.*, 250.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 229.

¹³⁷ In *Galatians*, Luther also describes the imputation of Christ's righteousness as "being covered with this cloud" of Christ's righteousness. Luther, *Galatians*, 357.

¹³⁸ The understanding of "alien righteousness" (Christ's righteousness) is crucial in Luther's doctrine of justification. In his "Righteousness," Luther clearly elucidates how Christ's righteousness becomes ours. Gritsch, *Luther*, 85-86. Luther's *The Freedom of a Christian* (1520) contains his most important discussion of justification. He defends the doctrine of justification by faith alone, not by any human works. "The Freedom of a Christian," in Lull, *Luther*, 598, 585-629.

salvation. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us *extra nos* (outside of us). God declares us to be righteous based on the righteousness of God.¹³⁹

Luther bases his view of imputation on the idea that Christ's righteousness comes from outside of us (*extra nos*), *only* from God by his grace alone. At this point, Luther correlates the imputation of Christ's righteousness with the Reformation's *sola fide–sola gratia*, which helps us to see the exclusiveness of God's grace in justification.¹⁴⁰ In the workings of the Holy Spirit, Luther sees a connecting link between *sola fide–sola gratia* and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. In light of all this, there can be no doubt that Luther's view of justification attacks the Roman and Pelagian doctrines. For Luther, faith is not a condition of salvation, for faith is always the work of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, it is extremely important to understand that in his doctrine of imputation, Luther is determined to uphold his conviction of *sola fide–sola gratia*, with which he leads us into the greatness of God's grace in justification.

Furthermore, Luther makes it clear that in the *ordo salutis* (order of salvation), when the Holy Spirit visits a sinner by God's grace, God "imprints the Word in the heart" and the sinner "consents to it."¹⁴¹ He who works is indeed God: after Christ's righteousness is transferred to the wicked by God, they begin to love and to fulfill the

¹³⁹ According to Luther, the imputation of Christ's righteousness is based on *sola fide*. When Luther uses the slogan *sola fide*, he means that justification is obtained through *Christ alone* and through no other means.

¹⁴⁰ Luther supports the monergistic work of God in salvation as he answers the question: Who can reject the love of God? Luther tries to prove that God's love in salvation is the *irresistible* grace of God. Ibid., 120. Forde tells us an interesting illustration of "a lowly peasant" who secretly loves a pretty princess. It is a parable of God's *irresistible* love for us. Fundamental to Luther's doctrine of justification, Forde rightly concludes, is the view that God comes to us and declares "you are mine." Forde, 75-76. Forde emphasizes that justification is a matter of life and death to Christians. Forde makes it clear that Luther's theology strongly supports the divine initiative in justification.

law.¹⁴² Hence, the believer starts to apprehend God's promise through *sola fide–sola gratia*. On the other hand, no one can come to God without the work of the Holy Spirit because of his inability to obtain salvation.¹⁴³ Thus, every sinner needs the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which comes by faith through Christ alone.

How does the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked occur? How does Christ's righteousness become ours? Let us look at a few of Luther's own words on this point. First of all, Christ and the believer become "one body in spirit" through union by faith, and Christ's righteousness becomes the believer's.¹⁴⁴ In keeping with his doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and by using an image of human body, Luther stresses the crucial role of the Spirit in union with Christ. This union embraces both the Head (Christ) and the body (believers). Thus, Luther wants to speak of union with Christ in relation to imputation, faith, the Holy Spirit, and the gospel. It is important to note that crucial and essential to Luther's doctrine of *sola fide* and of imputation is *oneness* with Christ, for through union with Christ God transfers Christ's righteousness to the wicked. It is no accident that no one can stand before God as a justified person without the imputation of righteousness in Luther's justification. Let us look at another specific example. In his

¹⁴¹ Luther, *Galatians*, 284. For Luther, the justice of God was not a fearful phrase any more, but a sweet one of forgiveness, since Christ's righteousness is *reckoned* as ours. *Ibid.*, 322-23.

¹⁴² In Luther's theology, God's declaration comes first, and then assurance comes upon the wicked. Luther strongly vindicates this in his Catechism: "But the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in truth faith, just as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith." "The Small Catechism," in Lull, *Martin Luther*, 480-81.

¹⁴³ Luther, *Galatians*, 250, 257. Luther clearly states that due to the imputation of Adam's sin, human reason and human conscience cannot perceive the love of God without his grace. *Ibid.*, 117 (the imputation of Adam's sin), 316 (the impotence of reason), 323 (afflicted conscience).

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 110.

commentary on Galatians 2:20, Luther links his notion of union with Christ by faith alone to the imputation of Christ's righteousness:

Wherefore Christ and I in this behalf are both one. This union or conjunction, then, is the cause that I am delivered from the terror of the law and sin, am separated from myself, and translated unto Christ and His Kingdom, which is a kingdom of grace, righteousness, peace, joy, life, salvation, and eternal glory...; but as concerning justification, Christ and I must be entirely conjoined and united together, so that He may live in me, and I in Him.... I am now one with Christ, that is to say, Christ's righteousness, victory, and life are mine. Again, Christ may say, I am that sinner, that is, his sins and his death are Mine, because he is united and joined to Me, and I to him.¹⁴⁵

Therefore, Luther is consistent in his stress on union with Christ as the work of the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁶

Central to Luther's doctrine of justification is not only his concept of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but also his distinctive doctrine of union with Christ. Luther, as we have seen, describes the imputation of Christ's righteousness as the imputation of *alien* righteousness, which comes from outside of us (*extra nos*). Another important reference to the imputation of Christ's righteousness is found in his commentary on Galatians 3:6. Again, the Reformer maintains that Christ's righteousness becomes the believer's through God's imputation by faith alone:

Christian righteousness consists of these two things: faith, which gives glory to God, and in God's imputation. For faith is weak, and God's imputation must be joined to it. Thus a Christian man is both righteous and a sinner, holy and profane, an enemy of God, and yet a child of God.... If you believe, you are righteous, because you give glory to God, that He is almighty, merciful, and true.... His righteousness is your righteousness, and your sin He took upon himself.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 110-11. By faith, for Luther, believers become "members" of Christ's body (Eph. 5:30). Ibid. For Luther, faith alone is counted for righteousness. Luther states, "So God accepts or accounts us as righteous for our faith in Christ only." Ibid., 95.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 104-20.

This statement shows that Luther's idea of *sola fide* and his doctrine of God's imputation are inseparable in the doctrine of justification. This corresponds exactly to Luther's theology of justification. Clearly, Luther's understanding of the relation between *sola fide* and God's imputation is based on his concept of union with Christ. In Christ, the Christian possesses all of the great blessings of the gospel, including Christ's righteousness. Remarkably, Luther thinks that in union with Christ, Christ's righteousness is *counted, reckoned, transferred, or imputed* to the Christian's account through faith alone.

It is clear, then, that Luther's concept of oneness with Christ is the key to his doctrine of justification, for Luther's idea of *sola fide* can be linked to the imputation of Christ's righteousness through his idea of union with Christ. Luther's doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness had a great impact on the Christian church. Therefore, no one can understand Luther's concept of faith correctly if he does not understand his concept of union with Christ in the doctrine of justification.

To sum up, Luther's explanation of the imputation of Christ's righteousness remarkably displays his doctrine of justification. First, the Holy Spirit comes to the sinner and gives him faith. Second, God helps the will to apprehend the gospel through the word of God, since the human will is unable to do so, due to original sin. Third, through the work of the Holy Spirit, the human heart consents to the gospel. Fourth, by faith the sinner becomes one body with Christ. For Luther, righteousness is begun with faith, and

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 148. In "The Freedom of a Christian," Luther clearly speaks of the imputation of Christ's righteousness: "Abraham's faith was reckoned to him as righteousness." "The Freedom of a Christian," in Lull, *Luther*, 603. For putting on Christ's righteousness, see Luther, *Galatians*, 229-30, 187-88.

the imputation of Christ's righteousness completes it through union with Christ.¹⁴⁸ In Christ, believers can be *reckoned* as righteous *sola fide*. In the process of salvation, through union with Christ, by faith the sinner is *counted* as righteous by God. Since the legal union between Christ and believers is established by God himself, union with Christ is certainly God's work.

However, one must be careful in understanding Luther's *ordo salutis* (order of salvation). When he explains the concept of order, he does not mean it temporarily, but logically. Luther is speaking of logical precedence, not temporal precedence. Union and imputation occur simultaneously in his understanding, for there is no time gap between them. At this point, Luther implies that one logically depends on the other in justification: imputation depends upon union, and union upon imputation. Thus, Luther does not hesitate to relate faith and union in his theology. The correlation between faith and union plays an important role in Luther's doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. In relation to Christ's righteousness, Luther unites union and imputation together to elucidate the justification of the wicked.

John Calvin (1509-1564)

As with Luther, Calvin's rejection of the medieval idea of works-righteousness takes up a great deal of Calvin's attention in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* and *Romans*. It is important to recall that Calvin argued against the Scholastic idea of supererogatory works, contending that the Scholastics misunderstood original sin.¹⁴⁹ The

¹⁴⁸ B. A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 85.

term *imputation* is employed by Calvin in his discussion of Adam's relation to his descendants. The term is used in several places, as Calvin speaks of Adam's first sin as being transferred to all mankind after the Fall. The most important of these is found in *Romans*:

The first is, that by Adam's sin we are not condemned through *imputation* alone, as though we were punished only for the sin of another; but we suffer his punishment, because we also ourselves are guilty; for as our nature is vitiated in him, it is *regarded* by God as having committed sin. But through the righteousness of Christ we are restored in a different way to salvation.¹⁵⁰

Following in the footsteps of Luther, Calvin also opposes the Scholastic idea of works-righteousness. Why does Calvin link the supererogatory works to original sin? Why is it necessary to understand the doctrine of Adam's sin in order to unveil the fault of the Scholastic idea of the supererogatory works? The problem with the Scholastics is that the main error in their notion of supererogatory works resulted from their denial of original sin. Calvin insists that denial or change of the effects of the imputation of Adam's sin results in a denial of the necessity of Christ's righteousness in salvation.¹⁵¹ Indeed, without some such consideration of imputation, the Scholastic argument from

¹⁴⁹ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.14.12-15. See also *ibid.*, 3.14.16. In the same way, in *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*, Calvin criticized works of supererogation. Calvin, *Necessity*, 44.

¹⁵⁰ Calvin, *Romans*, 210 (italics added). Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.1.5-9. In Calvin's theology, all human works are not only imperfect, but also corrupted by the imputation of Adam's sin to us. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.14.7; cf. 4.1.17. In the second book of the *Institutes*, Calvin clearly develops the doctrine of original sin. *Ibid.*, 2.1.1-11. In Calvin's view of original sin, human beings have no "spiritual discernment," for human faculties such as reason, the will, and the mind are totally corrupted by the imputation of Adam's sin. *Ibid.*, 2.2.12, 2.2.18, 2.2.20, 2.2.27.

¹⁵¹ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.4.3. To Calvin, all good works are corrupt, because they are "works of pollution." *Ibid.*, 3.14.7, 2.2.2, 2.3.2. For Calvin, since people have "no ability to pursue righteousness," only God gives "a new will" to obtain salvation. *Ibid.*, 2.2.1, 2.5.15.

In Calvin's thought, the power of the human will, whereby the Scholastics exalt in salvation, will end up discarding any necessity for the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Here a problem arises in connection with the Scholastic notion of the imputation of Adam's sin. Calvin claims: "The point on which the world always goes astray, (for this error has prevailed in almost every age,) is in imagining that man,

free will fails in justification. For if the “bondage of sin” exists in human beings, then they are unable to prepare themselves to receive God’s grace.¹⁵² Granting much of Luther’s view of *sola gratia* in the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ, Calvin does at times speak of God as the sole Author of “spiritual life from beginning to end.”¹⁵³ Calvin believes that no one can turn to Christ’s perfect work, considering the perfection that God requires from us. Rather, claims Calvin, saving faith cannot be generated by man, due to the imputation of Adam’s sin. Obviously, for Calvin it would be a big mistake to suppose that there is no imputation of Adam’s sin, and it would be foolish to conclude that human beings have the ability to earn God’s righteousness of their own free will.¹⁵⁴

however partially defective he may be, still in some degree merits the favour of God by works.” Calvin, *Necessity*, 40-41.

¹⁵² Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.3.5-8. See also *ibid.*, 2.2.1. This shows Calvin’s understanding of grace and free will. In general, Calvin defends Augustine’s monergistic view of God’s grace in salvation. Calvin, *Bondage*, 128, 135, 213, 90-95. Cf. Seeberg, 2:398-400; Sproul, *Willing*, 105-18.

¹⁵³ Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.3.6. In Calvin’s thought, God’s prevenient grace precedes regeneration. *Ibid.*, 2.1.1-3.4.14. Calvin rightly thinks that God’s grace precedes “every good work.” *Ibid.*, 2.3.6. By denouncing the Scholastic doctrine of repentance, Calvin also argues that repentance cannot be the “cause of forgiveness of sins.” *Ibid.*, 3.14.3. It must be noted that repentance and regeneration are used synonymously in Calvin’s theology. Calvin thinks that believers are “restored” by regeneration throughout their lives. *Ibid.*, 3.3.9. Calvin defines repentance as “the true turning of our life to God, a turning that arises from a pure and earnest fear of him.” *Ibid.*, 3.3.5. Calvin is tireless in his stress on the Holy Spirit as the sole Author in sanctification.

¹⁵⁴ It must be remembered that Calvin advocates the immediate imputation of Adam’s sin to his posterity. At this point, it is necessary to note that in the Samur School, Josua Placaesus (1596-1655), under the influence of Cameron, put forward the idea of “mediate imputation,” which denied the immediate imputation of Adam’s first sin to his posterity. Placaesus also rejected the imputation of Adam’s guilt to his posterity, as well as the penal consequence of Adam’s sin to his posterity. Charles Hodge suggests several reasons to object to Placaesus’s doctrine of mediate imputation: (1) it makes inherent corruption the ground of condemnation, (2) it denies the penalty of hereditary corruption in all human beings, (3) it denies God’s covenant with Adam, (4) it destroys the analogy between Adam and Christ in the doctrine of justification, and (5) it supports the false idea that no one can be rightly punished for the sin of Adam. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989), 2:207-209, 210-14. Likewise, Placaesus failed to see the wrath of God in the doctrine of salvation. Since Placaesus avoided God’s imputation of the guilt of Adam’s first sin to his posterity, he finally distorts the doctrine of salvation, for justification for the sinner is the transition from sin in salvation.

Furthermore, the Formula Consensus Helvetica (1675) condemned the Amyraldian idea of hypothetical universalism and Placaesus’s doctrine of mediate imputation. This Calvinistic confession

Just as the necessity of Christ's righteousness is for Calvin always deeply rooted in the idea of the imputation of Adam's sin, while the idea of faith alone is necessitated by human depravity, so our participation in Christ's righteousness arises in connection with Calvin's doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin. Perhaps, as we have seen in connection with the instrument of faith, it is useful to recall that Calvin seeks to prove how union and imputation interact with one another in justification. Since Calvin's system is correlates the imputation of Adam's sin with the necessity of Christ's righteousness, it is possible to derive the believer's union with Christ from his idea of *sola fide*. For example, Calvin's argument against Osiander clearly shows the importance of the believer's union with Christ through the *sola fide*:

Now, lest Osiander deceive the unlearned by his cavils, I confess that we are deprived of this utterly incomparable good until Christ is made ours. Therefore, the joining together of Head and members, that indwelling of Christ in our hearts—in short, that *mystical union*—are accorded by us the highest degree of importance, so that Christ, having been made ours, makes us sharers with him in the gifts with which he has been endowed. We do not, therefore, contemplate him outside ourselves from afar in order that *his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body*—in short, because he deigns to make us *one with him*.... As if we were to deprive Christ of his right when we say that by faith we come empty to him to make room for his grace in order that he alone may fill us!¹⁵⁵

teaches the immediate imputation of original sin and the extent of Christ's atonement for the elect. Also the Westminster Confession of Faith rightly points out that there are two aspects of sin (chap. VI, secs. IV-V): guilt and corruption. Cf. Seeberg, 425-26; A. A. Hodge, *Confession*, 105-17; John Murray, "Theology," 137-38. Placaeus's method can be summarized by saying that the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity was "mediated through the inheritance from him [Adam] of a corrupt nature." In eighteenth-century America, some New England theologians, such as the New Divinity theologians, were influenced by the doctrine of the mediate imputation of Adam's sin. Murray, *Imputation*, 42-47; R. Nicole, "Amyraldism," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair Ferguson and J. I. Packer (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988).

¹⁵⁵ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.10 (italics added). This statement shows the federal headship of Christ to his people. See also *ibid.*, 2.12.1, 2.12.4, 2.13.1, 2.17.1, 3.1.1, 4.2.5-6, 4.6.9, 4.1.5. It is important to note that in Calvin's theology faith "engrafts us spiritually into the body of Christ." *Ibid.*, 2.13.2.

This statement contains many of the themes that are central in Calvin's understanding of union with Christ. The *mystical union* is important in Calvin's understanding of union with Christ.¹⁵⁶ Actually, this statement where Calvin uses the term *unio mystica* is a rejection of the ideas of Osiander.¹⁵⁷ Calvin's understanding of what he calls mystical union correlates directly with his understanding of justification and imputation. How does union with Christ happen? By describing union with Christ as "engrafted into Christ," Calvin's view of union is similar to Luther's understanding of oneness with Christ.¹⁵⁸ As we have seen, Luther's doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin is also found in Calvin's theology.

Nevertheless, it is interesting to see how Calvin explains the two unions of Adam and Christ. "Why did Paul," asks Calvin on Romans 5:12-21, "form a comparison between Adam and Christ?"¹⁵⁹ Probably Calvin is reluctant to simply express the two

¹⁵⁶ It is important to note that Calvin's notion of *legal* union is related to *forensic* justification. In *Institutes* 3.11.2, Calvin says: "If an innocent accused person be summoned before the judgment seat, where he will be judged according to his innocence, he is said to be 'justified' before the judge. Thus, justified before God is the man who, freed from the company of sinners, has God to witness and affirm his righteousness." Justification includes the notion of forensic declaration, as Calvin states in *Institutes* 3.11.11: Paul the apostle "includes the whole of righteousness in free remission, declaring that man blessed whose sins are covered, whose iniquities God has forgiven, and whose transgressions God does not charge to his account. Thence, he judges and reckons his happiness because in this way he is righteous, not intrinsically but by imputation." Cf. Sproul, *Faith*, 100-102. R. C. Sproul summarizes the forensic justification of the Reformers: "The Reformers reviewed justification as being forensic, resting on God's judicial declaration that the sinner is counted as just or righteous by virtue of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. To be declared just on the sole ground of the imputation of Christ's righteousness was to them the very essence of the gospel." *Ibid.*, 44.

¹⁵⁷ Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 93, 98-99, 194; Seeberg, 369-72; McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 26, 36-37.

¹⁵⁸ Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.12.1, 2.13.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, 3.2.24. Like Luther, Calvin also uses images of a robe of Christ's righteousness as being "covered," "clothed," or "furnished" by God to express the imputation of Christ's righteousness. *Ibid.*, 3.11.2, 3.11.11, 3.15.12, 3.15.3. As God imputes Christ's righteousness to people, God "clothes" or "furnishes" them with Christ's righteousness. *Ibid.*, 3.14.12. In Calvin's view, God also covers people by the *alien* righteousness of Christ. *Ibid.*, 3.14.13. It is the free imputation given by God. *Ibid.*, 2.7.2. Calvin's theology clearly shows Luther's *alien* righteousness of Christ.

federal representatives of Adam and Christ. Rather, Adam in Romans 5:14, for Calvin, is the “type of Christ.”¹⁶⁰ Calvin states: “But in saying that Adam bore a resemblance to Christ, there is nothing incongruous; for some likeness often appears in things wholly contrary.”¹⁶¹ Thus, the term *type* signifies that there is the real One, who is Christ—the real Head of the human race, to come. However, Calvin is saying here that in connection with the headship of Christ, Adam can be considered the head of the human race, since he is the type of Christ. Calvin’s idea of the two headships of Adam and Christ is most clearly expressed in his explanation of the two roots of the human race, although he does not wish to call Adam explicitly “the head of the human race” or “the representative of the human race.”¹⁶² When Calvin brings up the question of the nature of union with Christ, he does not mean that Christ is the Head for all mankind in this *unio mystica*.

What then is the scope of this *unio mystica* in Calvin’s thought? His answer to the question is to the elect. In Calvin’s understanding, election is by God’s sovereign will, apart from anything in the wicked.¹⁶³ Since election is God’s choice, the chosen have *legal* union with Christ as an immediate outcome of justification by faith alone. However, some people are excluded from this *unio mystica* with Christ. As he puts it in *Institutes*

¹⁵⁹ Calvin, *Romans*, 199-216 (on Rom. 5:12-21).

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 205. Calvin explains: “The sum of the whole is this—that Christ surpasses Adam.” *Ibid.*, 209. See also Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.7.1.

¹⁶² As Calvin expounds 1 Cor. 15:45, he develops this idea: Adam and Christ are “two sources” or “two roots of the human race.” In this way, Calvin is telling us about Adam’s resemblance to Christ as well as his difference. Calvin, *Corinthians*, 53. Cf. Murray, *Imputation*, 24-41.

¹⁶³ In relation to election, Calvin criticizes the idea that faith has merit: “But here we must beware of two errors: for some make man God’s co-worker, to ratify election by his consent. Thus, according to them, man’s will is superior to God’s plan.” Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.24.3.

3.21.7: “But as the Lord seals his elect by call and justification, so, by shutting off the reprobate from knowledge of his name or from the sanctification of his Spirit.”¹⁶⁴ While Calvin does not give priority to faith in justification, he actually links union with Christ to God’s sovereign grace in his concept of election.¹⁶⁵ On the basis of this analysis, we see that Luther’s presentation of the imputation of Adam’s sin and of Christ’s righteousness is developed and modified by Calvin in connection with the headships of Adam and Christ in Pauline theology. As we have seen, through the divine constitution of the headship of Christ, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer by mystical union with Christ in Calvin’s theology. What then is the role of the Holy Spirit in this mystical union of the believer with Christ? Calvin’s doctrine of *forensic* justification strongly emphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit in salvation by saying that “The Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself.”¹⁶⁶ Overall, Calvin’s concept of *legal* union contains an element of God’s sovereign free grace in justification.

What is the relation between the believer’s *legal* union with Christ and Christ’s righteousness? The most significant point of this relationship is how one explains the imputation of Christ’s righteousness in union with Christ. There is a place where Calvin’s

¹⁶⁴ In this sense, in Calvin’s doctrine of atonement, Christ died for the elect. See also *Institutes*, 3.21.5, 3.24.5. Calvin also calls salvation “the election of grace.” *Ibid.*, 3.21.1. For Calvin, election is “in Christ alone.” Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.24.5; G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Divine Election* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), 132. Berkouwer clearly points out that for Calvin the doctrine of election must be bounded by the Scriptures. We should also note Berkouwer’s statement that Calvin rejects “any speculation with God’s election” beyond God’s wisdom shown in the Scriptures. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 14-17, 105-10.

¹⁶⁵ As Berkouwer puts it, “But within the synergistic idea of cooperation the sovereignty of election and grace is in danger.” Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 47. Berkouwer rightly speaks of Calvin’s notion of grace as providing Calvin’s concept of election by criticizing “any form of analytical doctrine of self-justification.” He explains, “Calvin did not at all intend to say that election precedes grace, and therefore is without grace.” *Ibid.*, 142, 155.

debate with Osiander's doctrine of justification discloses the relationship between union with Christ and Christ's righteousness. Through the believer's union with Christ, Calvin recognizes that Osiander seeks to prove that the substance of Christ's *alien* righteousness by his divine nature is transferred to us. On his view of the relation of union with Christ to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, Osiander's problem begins with the doctrine of Christ. Osiander's doctrine implies that the divine nature of Christ becomes our righteousness in justification. Calvin raises questions about this view. Calvin writes that Osiander rejects the concept of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Calvin makes it clear that it is not the divine nature of Christ pouring into us, but the imputation of Christ's righteousness by the mystical union with Christ through faith. In his *Institutes*, Calvin rejects Osiander's idea of the indwelling of Christ in justification:

The fact, then, that he [Osiander] insists so violently upon essential righteousness and essential indwelling of Christ in us has this result: first, he holds that God pours himself into us as a gross mixture, just as he fancies a physical eating in the Lord's Supper; secondly, that he breathes his righteousness upon us, by which we may be really righteous with him, since according to Osiander this righteousness is both God himself and the goodness or holiness or integrity of God.¹⁶⁷

There are two more observations to be made with respect to Osiander. First of all, as for the two natures of Christ, Calvin claims that Osiander confuses the alien righteousness of Christ with sanctification. Calvin correctly states that the divine nature of Christ cannot be mixed with our own for our justification. Osiander replaces Christ's righteousness with the divine nature of Christ in justification. Second, the believer's union with Christ becomes the indwelling of Christ in Osiander's understanding of justification. In Osiander's thought, the indwelling of Christ turns out to be the source of

¹⁶⁶ Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.1-3. For Calvin, by the Holy Spirit believers are "engrafted into" Christ, who is their Head. Ibid.

righteousness. Osiander basically denies the doctrine of justification by faith alone in arguing that justification is the imputation of Christ's divine nature to the sinner.

Osiander's doctrine of justification has an *analytical* element.¹⁶⁸ With his doctrine of union with Christ, Osiander destroys not only the doctrine of justification, but also the core of the gospel.¹⁶⁹ Basically, Calvin adopts Luther's teaching of a double transfer in salvation: that in Christ our sin is perfectly taken away, and Christ's perfect righteousness is perfectly imputed to us.¹⁷⁰ Calvin is successful in combining the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness with the idea of the mystical union of Christ and his people by faith.

In conclusion, the medieval theologians weakened the need for Christ's righteousness in their doctrine of justification, for they believed in works-righteousness on the basis of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit). Their teachings were aggressively attacked by Calvin who protected the doctrine of *sola gratia* in salvation. For Calvin, sanctification cannot precede justification. In Calvin's theology, Christians will inevitably bear the fruits of saving faith if there is justification by faith. Calvin developed Luther's doctrine of justification by *sola fide–sola gratia*. Like Luther, Calvin was not

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 3.11.10. Cf. 3.11.5-6.

¹⁶⁸ Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 98-100; Seeberg, 369-72; "Andreas Osiander," in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, in his discussion of Osiander's doctrine of imputation, Calvin correctly explains the necessity of the *irresistible* grace of God in salvation. Ibid., 2.11.11, 3.2.41. Tamburello sees the supremacy of God's grace in Calvin's doctrine of justification, but McGrath fails to see the point in his excellent book on the subject. Denise E. Tamburello, *Union with Christ: John Calvin and the Mysticism of St. Bernard* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 50-55; McGrath, *Iustitia: From 1500*, 32-39.

¹⁷⁰ Calvin's statement that justification consists in the "remission of sins and the imputation of Christ's righteousness" proves that he is a faithful follower of Luther in the doctrine of justification. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.2.

interested in the *ordo salutis* (order of salvation).¹⁷¹ Calvin's primary concern, like Augustine's and Luther's, in the doctrine of imputation was to praise God's grace in salvation.¹⁷² Through the instrument of faith, God imputes Christ's righteousness to the wicked in Calvin's theology. Christ is our only justification in Calvin's theology. Calvin's idea of *legal* union with Christ points out the necessity of divine grace as the primary source of salvation. Through faith, Christ's righteousness is imputed to us *sola gratia*.

The imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked was at the heart of Calvin's doctrine of justification. Remarkably, Calvin's aim in developing the doctrines of faith, union, and imputation was to stress the exclusiveness of God's grace in salvation. To Calvin, the only necessary work for the justification of the wicked was God's work through the Holy Spirit: the giving of faith, the uniting of the believer with Christ, and the imputing of Christ's righteousness. There is no doubt that Calvin followed Martin Luther in the doctrine of *justification by faith alone through Christ alone*.

D. Conclusion

The great blessings of the gospel seemed unreachable in the medieval church. In the Reformation, in keeping with Augustine's theology of grace, Martin Luther revealed not only the corruptions of the medieval church, but also the truth of the gospel through the doctrine of *justification by faith alone through Christ alone by God's grace alone*.

¹⁷¹ For Calvin, God opens the eyes of the wicked to see God's goodness first. Then by faith God forgives sins and imputes Christ's righteousness to the sinner. Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.16, 3.3.2. Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 28-29.

¹⁷² Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.4.3.

The rediscovery of the gospel has impacted the whole world through the doctrine of *justification by faith alone*. The Luther's formula of *sola fide* in justification was established by his doctrine of *sola scriptura*. Luther stood against the supposed efficaciousness of human merit in salvation and the distortion of *sola scriptura* in the medieval church. Along with the idea of *sola fide–sola gratia*, Luther set forth the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Luther made a great effort to show that the truth of the gospel is lost without the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

Another important figure in the development of the doctrine of justification during the Reformation was John Calvin, who rightly recognized the importance of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Calvin, like Luther, was not willing to tolerate the idea of *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) in salvation. In arguing against the Scholastics, Calvin ruled out human merit in his *synthetic* view of justification. Calvin correctly warned that they jeopardized the gospel with their *analytical* doctrine of justification. The Scholastics left themselves open to the charge of Pelagianism by Calvin. In opposition to the medieval theologians who undermined the sufficiency of Christ's merit in salvation, Calvin argued that they also finally denied Christ's righteousness to the sinner. Calvin not only believed that Christ's righteousness was necessary for justification, but also claimed further that the Scholastics eventually altered the fundamental message of *justification sola fide–sola gratia*.

The intention of Luther and Calvin, in the spirit of Augustinian theology, was to exalt the grace of God as the decisive cause in justification. Luther and Calvin also taught that the formula in the doctrine of *forensic* justification is *sola fide*. In their theology, *sola*

fide is closely related to *sola gratia* on the basis of the vicarious work of Christ. In the interpretation of Luther and Calvin, *sola fide* and *sola gratia* mean the same thing, for without the help of God, not only is man completely incapable of possessing faith, but the human will lacks the power to obtain the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The Scholastic theologians, however, remained convinced that human beings can earn salvation by doing their meritorious works. But the Reformers claimed that they put too much emphasis on the power of the human will, rather than on God's grace. Luther and Calvin established that union with Christ by faith discloses the relationship between sovereign grace and human merit. Through the doctrine of union with Christ, the Reformers successfully demonstrated *sola gratia* as the only source of salvation.

In Reformation theology, *justification by faith alone* is a matter of life and death. The Reformers certainly had no desire to exalt human works in salvation. Rather, Luther and Calvin praised God's grace through the doctrine of justification, for God himself is the sole Author of salvation from justification through sanctification. The Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification is still absolutely important, since it reveals the necessity of Christ's righteousness, given the inability of the human will in salvation. Only the imputation of Christ's righteousness makes it possible for people to be truly justified. The clear message of the Reformation doctrine of *forensic* justification is that if there is no imputation of Christ's righteousness, the gospel is futile.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE GREAT AWAKENING

A. Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758)

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the imputation of Christ's righteousness in the Great Awakening. In order to discuss it, one must first have an understanding of the theology of Jonathan Edwards and Timothy Dwight.¹ First of all, we will examine the views of Jonathan Edwards, who is known as the father of New England Theology. Edwards was also an important figure in the Great Awakening of the eighteenth century.

The Great Awakening, according to Edwards, happened neither by human efforts nor because of human preparatory works. In his book *The Great Awakening*, Edwards denies that human works play any part in salvation.² In this respect, revivals and the justification of sinners are closely related, for they raise a similar question: "Who is the author of revivals or salvation?" Edwards makes it clear that salvation is solely God's work. His soteriology is deeply rooted in the doctrine of justification.

¹ For both Edwards and Dwight, as we mentioned in the Introduction, we will have two sections: *the justification of the wicked* and *the imputation of Christ's righteousness*. First, in the first section we will discuss original sin, God's grace, free will, faith, and the necessity of Christ's righteousness in connection with justification. Then, for *the imputation of Christ's righteousness*, we will discuss *forensic* justification, election, *legal* union, and the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness.

² Jonathan Edwards, *Great Awakening*, ed. C. C. Goen (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972). As we saw in the second chapter, Edwards has the Calvinistic view of revivalism. Edwards's idea of revivalism is closely linked to the doctrine of justification, for regeneration and justification are the sovereign works of God in his theology.

1. The Justification of the Wicked

With respect to the doctrine of justification, Jonathan Edwards stands in the line of the Reformers, not in the line of the English Puritans.³ Nothing can distract Edwards from God's grace in the doctrine of justification by faith alone. What is the relation between faith and works in salvation? What is the role of faith in justification? What is the role of the human will in justification? Can the human will break the power of sin in Edwards's soteriology?

In *Freedom of the Will*, Edwards points out that the doctrine of the human will is of crucial importance because it is related to the necessity of imputed righteousness. He attacks the allegedly autonomous power of the human will in Arminianism:

The main objection of Arminians against this doctrine [the doctrine of *efficacious grace*] is, that it is inconsistent with their self-determining freedom of will; and that it is repugnant to the nature of virtue, that it should be wrought in the heart by the determining efficacy and power of another, instead of its being owing to a self-moving power; that in that case, the good which is wrought, would not be our virtue, but rather God's virtue; because it is not the person in whom it is wrought, that is the determining author of it, but God that wrought it in him.⁴

³ For Edwards, justification by faith alone is the most crucial doctrine. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, rev. Edward Hickman, vol. 1 (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1995), 620; Jonathan Edwards, *Justification by Faith Alone*, ed. Don Kistler (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 2000), 145; Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 14, *Sermons and Discourses: 1723-1729*, ed. Kenneth P. Minkema (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 60. Justification is "an act of divine favor towards the sinner which forgives sins and approves him as righteous." Edwards, *Sermons and Discourses: 1723-1729*, 60. Conrad Cherry's book, *Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal*, is useful to show that faith plays an important role in Edwards's doctrine of justification. Conrad Cherry, *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1990). Cherry rejects Miller's view that Edwards is an empiricist following John Locke and Isaac Newton. Edwards, for Cherry, remains in the line of Augustine and Calvin. Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards* (1949; reprint, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981).

⁴ Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 1, *Freedom of the Will*, ed. Paul Ramsey (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 433. Edwards argues that without God's grace, no one is able to be saved. It is called "efficacious grace" or "irresistible grace." Ibid. In *Freedom of the Will*, Edwards fights against "Pelagians, semi-Pelagians, Jesuits, Socinians, and Arminians." Cf. Ibid., 203.

Here Edwards indicates that human beings have no “freedom of the will” to obtain salvation, contrary to the Arminian doctrine of “self-determining power,” because of their “moral inability.”⁵ Moral inability is the “evil inclination” of human beings.⁶ The Arminian doctrine of salvation is wrong because it denies “the inability of unregenerate men to perform the conditions of salvation, and the commands of God requiring spiritual duties.”⁷ Edwards later adds that the Arminian doctrine of self-determining will produces absolute independence in salvation:

The doctrine of a self-determining will, as the ground of all moral good and evil, tends to prevent any proper exercises of faith in God and Christ, in the affair of our salvation, as it tends to prevent all dependence upon them. For, instead of this, it teaches a kind of absolute independence of all those things, that are of chief importance in this affair; our righteousness depending originally on our own acts, as self-determined. Thus our own holiness is from ourselves, as its determining cause, and its original and highest source.⁸

Edwards takes a firm stand on the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which requires imputed righteousness, by denouncing the Arminian doctrine of the self-determining power of the will in salvation.⁹ Since Edwards dislikes that Arminian idea of the autonomous power of the human will, he would also oppose the medieval idea of *facere quod in se est* (doing what is in him).¹⁰ As Jonathan Edwards notes, the idea of

⁵ Ibid., 452.

⁶ Ibid., 309.

⁷ Ibid., 269.

⁸ Ibid., 468-69.

⁹ Ibid., 469. According to Edwards, only God has the “highest possible freedom.” Ibid., 364, 389. According to Arminian doctrine, as Edwards criticizes it, the doctrine of human “sovereign power” makes human beings the author of salvation, since they have “perfect freedom” to choose with their own power, even in the act of conversion. This Arminian doctrine of self-determining power has to be corrected, according to Edwards, for only God is “self-existent Being.” Ibid., 181-83, 204-5, 342, 436, 469-70.

¹⁰ Ibid., 318-99.

self-determining power basically distorts the doctrine of justification by faith alone by excluding the necessity of Christ's righteousness.¹¹ Edwards's criticism of the Arminians can be explained by saying that the denial of moral ability due to Adam's sin leads dangerously to the denial of God's grace in justification by faith alone.¹²

God's assistance or influence, must be determining and decisive, or must be attended with a moral necessity of the events; and so, that God gives virtue, holiness and conversion to sinners, that the effect will infallibly follow by a moral necessity, which is what Calvinists mean by efficacious and irresistible grace.¹³

Edwards's distinctive doctrine of moral necessity elucidates moral inability.¹⁴ He uses words like "necessity," "connection," "causes," and "motives" to explain the acts of volition or choice. Human beings need motives (connection or causes) to activate the power of the will, for they are not self-existent.¹⁵ His doctrine of moral inability lays the foundation for the necessity of God's efficacious grace in the justification of the wicked. God's efficacious grace is closely related to the doctrine of limited atonement in Edwards's theology.¹⁶ Edwards presupposes that God's efficacious grace follows God's

¹¹ Ibid., 374. Edwards argues that human beings have no righteousness in themselves. Ibid., 340.

¹² Edwards defines "moral necessity" as "necessity of connection and consequence, which arises from such moral causes, as the strength of inclination, or motives, and the connection which there is in many cases between these, such certain volitions and actions." Ibid., 156.

¹³ Ibid., 434.

¹⁴ Ibid., 159.

¹⁵ Edwards explains that because of "want of sufficient motives" human beings are "morally unable to obey a command of moral government." In this sense, the human will is "unable [impossible] to change itself." Ibid., 304-305. Edwards uses three words interchangeably in his book, *Freedom of the Will: necessity, inability, and impossibility*. Ibid., 155, 285-87, 360, 363 (necessity and impossibility), 269 (inability and necessity), 305-307 (impossibility and inability).

¹⁶ In Edwards's theology, the word "limited atonement" is not restricted to its use to refer to the notion of the closed number of the elect, but to the idea of *sola gratia* in justification. Herman Hoeksema's assumption that the promise of the gospel is given *only* to the elect is severely criticized by Berkouwer and Anthony Hoekema. It is not hard to see that this "deterministic" doctrine of election destroys the "dynamic" power of the gospel. G. C. Berkouwer, *Divine Election* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,

foreknowledge to “pursue a proper design of the salvation of the elect.”¹⁷ God’s efficacious grace is “the strongest motive” for the wicked in salvation.¹⁸ In *Freedom of the Will*, we do not understand Edwards’s doctrine of regeneration if we ignore his idea of the “strongest motive.” The will always follows the strongest motive in Edwards’s view.¹⁹ Edwards claims that if one separates Adam’s sin from his posterity, salvation is still within the frame of works-righteousness, where such separation means the denial of God’s free grace in the doctrine of justification:

The things which have been said, obviate some of the chief objections of Arminians against the Calvinistic doctrine of the total depravity and corruption of man’s nature, whereby his heart is wholly under the power of sin, and he is utterly unable, without the interposition of sovereign grace, savingly to love God, believe in Christ, or do anything that is truly good and acceptable in God’s sight.²⁰

Edwards avoids the errors of the Council of Trent (1547), which attempted to destroy Luther’s doctrine of free justification. In Tridentine terms, justification follows

1960), 221-27; Anthony A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1994), 70-77. As for Edwards, the issue is neither *whether* few will be saved nor *whether* all will be saved, but the *nature* of general or universal atonement with an idea that “the decision lies with man” in salvation. Berkouwer rightly states that the Remonstrants want to draw a sharp distinction between “the subjectivity and objectivity in man’s salvation” while for Calvin the two are one. In Calvin’s soteriology, without the content of faith (the grace of God in Jesus Christ) *subjective* faith does not exist. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 229-231. For Calvin, the doctrine of election with the idea of *sola gratia* does not exclude human responsibility. Rather Calvin’s notion of *free* election excludes “all self-exaltation” in salvation. Ibid., 242. For the Reformers, faith acknowledges the grace of God that is shown in the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. *Sola fide* in their system means that the wicked rest *only* in the words of God that are “yes” in Jesus Christ. They defend that a believer does not trust in his trust but in the word of God, for the word of God creates faith in the hearts of the wicked through the work of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, *sola scriptura*, *sola gratia*, *sola fide* and *solus Christus* are closely related in Reformation doctrine of justification.

¹⁷ Ibid., 435. Edwards says, “God has the actual salvation or redemption of a certain number in his proper absolute design [absolute decree], and of a certain number only.” Ibid. Edwards’s emphasis, like Calvin, is on the supreme grace of God in salvation, not on the scope of salvation.

¹⁸ Edwards defines “motive” as the “whole of that which moves, excites or invites the mind to volition” Ibid., 141. He calls the strongest motive “the greatest degree of previous tendency to excite and induce the choice.” Ibid., 142.

¹⁹ Ibid., 141-42.

²⁰ Ibid., 432.

preparation, and is a gradual process.²¹ The Council of Trent insisted that “they [the adults] are moved freely toward God, believing to be true what has been divinely revealed and promised, especially that the sinner is justified by God *by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus* (Rom. 3:24).”²² The Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century resulted in justification by works. With the idea of preparation, the Church believed that sinners must first believe God’s revelations and promises. Luther’s doctrine of the bondage of the will opposed their doctrine of self-righteousness in justification.

When Edwards attacks the Arminian notion of self-determining power, he lays the foundation of justification by faith alone through Christ alone by God’s grace alone. He correctly understands Luther’s concept of God’s grace in justification in relation to his doctrine of total depravity. Similarly in *Freedom of the Will*, to unveil the danger of the Arminian doctrine of the self-determining power of the will, Edwards’s soteriology appears to be a distinctive reflection of Luther’s doctrine of justification by faith alone. For Edwards, there is no autonomous power of the will to obtain salvation, for there is no inherent goodness in human beings. If there is autonomous power in the human will, then there would be no need for the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.

In Edwards’s system, God’s efficacious grace, as the strongest motive, “moves or excites the will” with some “strength” or “tendency” or “advantage.”²³ As acts are

²¹ Mark A. Noll, ed., *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1997), 175-76 (italics not added). In Edwards’s theology, justification involves two things: the remission of sins and the reward of righteousness. Edwards, *Justification*, 134.

²² Noll, *Confessions*, 176.

²³ Edwards, *Freedom*, 142-44.

performed by the will after the will follows the mind, so the mind perceives the strongest motive. The active will of the sinner does not intend to resist the strongest motive when the effect of God's efficacious grace is very powerful:

When motives or previous bias are very strong, all will allow there is some difficulty in going against them. And if they were yet stronger, the difficulty would be still greater. And therefore, if more were still added to their strength, to a certain degree, it would make the difficulty so great, that it would be wholly impossible to surmount it; for this plain reason, because whatever power men may be supposed to have to surmount difficulties, yet that power is not infinite; and so goes not beyond certain limits.²⁴

The idea of the strongest motive as "difficulty" is fundamental in understanding the monergistic view of God's grace in Edwards's thinking, because it eventually proves the importance of *sola fide* in the Reformation doctrine of justification, which wholly depends on divine mercy. In a more aggressive way, Edwards develops the Reformation notion of the passive human role in regeneration. The more God's efficacious grace increases, the less sinners can resist it. To Edwards, the illuminating work of the Holy Spirit is needed for salvation, because the human will does not have ability to earn salvation.²⁵ He stresses the work of the Holy Spirit also in *Religious Affections*.²⁶ It is important to note that Edwards puts forward the concept of the "new spiritual sense" to explain the activity of the Holy Spirit in regeneration:

²⁴ Ibid., 157.

²⁵ Ibid., 219-21. The doctrine of God's grace and justification by faith are interdependent in Edwards's theology.

²⁶ In *Religious Affections*, Edwards insists that emotions are the foundation of Christian life. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 2, *Religious Affections*, ed. John Smith (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 107, 13, 96. The foundation of Edwards's theology is the Bible, neither emotions nor feelings. He strongly supports the Reformation idea of *sola scriptura* by saying, "If there be any part of the scheme here laid down, or any distinction here used, not warranted by Scripture, let it be rejected." Edwards, *Works*, rev. Hickman, 1:621.

Hence the works of the Spirit of God in regeneration is often in Scripture compared to the giving a *new sense*, giving eyes to see, and ears to hear, unstopping the ears of the deaf, and opening the eyes of them that were born blind, and turning from darkness unto light. And because this *spiritual sense* is immensely the most noble and excellent, and that without which all other principles of perception, and all our faculties are useless and vain; therefore the giving this *new sense*, with the blessed fruits and effects of it in the soul, is compared to a raising the dead, and to a new creation.²⁷

The strongest motive must be understood in relation to this new spiritual sense in Edwards's theology. Thus, Edwards excludes human meritorious works in salvation with the idea of a new spiritual sense. To Edwards, the Holy Spirit is a "saving influence" which gives a new spiritual sense in the matter of justification, as well as a "sanctifying influence" in the matter of sanctification.²⁸ It is the "immediate power" and work of the Holy Spirit in effecting justification, not as a gradual change (as maintained by the Council of Trent).²⁹ Edwards brings in the "freeness of gospel grace" in the doctrine of justification. When we have "an interest in Christ" by faith alone through the help of the Holy Spirit, we can have the "benefits of Christ" disregarding our meritorious works.³⁰ Can this interest have enough power to drive us to receive Christ as Lord and Savior? It is plain that for Edwards "we are justified only by the righteousness of Christ, and not by our righteousness."³¹ In Edwards's theology, salvation depends on Christ's righteousness

²⁷ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 206 (italics added). The mind perceives this new spiritual sense to see "God's loveliness and holiness." Ibid., 257-59.

²⁸ For Edwards, there are two kinds of divine graces, which work through the Holy Spirit: (1) a grace for sinners, and (2) another grace for believers. These graces can be called "saving" and "sanctifying" graces (influences) of the Holy Spirit. Ibid., 507, 135, 138, 146.

²⁹ Ibid., 138.

³⁰ Ibid., 455-57.

³¹ Ibid., 455.

with “the gospel doctrine of justification by faith alone without the works of the law.”³²

Edwards exposes the weakness of the Arminian notion of self-righteousness in the doctrine of justification as he brings up “two sorts of hypocrites”:

There are two sorts of hypocrites: one that are deceived with their outward morality and external religion; many of which are professed Arminians, in the doctrine of justification: and the other are those that are deceived with false discoveries and elevations; which often cry down works, and men’s own righteousness, and talk much of free grace; but at the same time make a righteousness of their discoveries, and of their humiliation, and exalt themselves to heaven with them.³³

On the necessity of Christ’s righteousness, Edwards remained unchanged to the end of his life. When we respond with interest in Christ through faith, God imputes Christ’s righteousness through the work of the Holy Spirit.³⁴ For Edwards, human obedience is inadequate for justification because of the moral inability of human beings.³⁵ Edwards then argues that the best obedience of human beings cannot satisfy God the divine Judge, for they are “unable to perform perfect obedience.”³⁶ So the question of “imperfect obedience” boils down to the question of how human beings can satisfy God with their imperfect obedience. It is similar to the “need of Christ’s satisfaction to atone” the sinners.³⁷ The atonement of Christ is necessary because of the sins of human beings.

³² Ibid., 459.

³³ Ibid., 173. Human righteousness is insufficient for the justification of sinners in Edwards’s theology. Ibid., 416.

³⁴ “Natural man” is unable to have this interest in Christ. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edward*, vol. 3, *Original Sin*, ed. Clyde A. Holbrook (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 355, 370. This interest follows a new spiritual sense as a fruit of God’s grace. Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 297; Edwards, *Justification*, 85, 104, 109.

³⁵ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 300-301.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

Both the necessity of Christ's atoning sacrifice and the necessity of Christ's righteousness derive from the sins of human beings.³⁸ By divine constitution, Adam is considered as one with his posterity in God's eyes.³⁹ "All" in Romans 5:12-14 means the whole of mankind, including infants, in Edwards's doctrine of original sin:⁴⁰

God, in each step of his proceeding with Adam, in relation to the covenant or constitution established with him, looked on his posterity as being one with him.... From which it will follow, that both guilt, or exposedness to punishment, and also depravity of heart, came upon Adam's posterity just as they came upon him, as much as if he and they had all coexisted, like a tree with branches; allowing only for the difference, necessarily resulting from the place Adam stood in, as head or root of the whole, and being first and most immediately dealt with, and most immediately acting and suffering.⁴¹

In Edwards's theology, the wicked are lawbreakers because of their solidarity with Adam in terms of the Covenant of Works.⁴² Edwards's view of the relation between original sin and human will is very important in his doctrine of salvation. In *Original Sin*, when Edwards explains original sin, he also stresses the free grace of God by faith through Christ's righteousness.⁴³ Works-righteousness through the Arminian self-

³⁸ Edwards, *Freedom*, 300. Edwards makes it clear that if there were no sins, there would be no need of Christ's death for sinners. *Ibid.*, 300-301.

³⁹ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 389-91, 346, 247, 251, 256. Adam is the head of the "human species." *Ibid.*, 260. On the doctrine of original sin, Edwards clearly opposes Arminianism and Pelagianism.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 346, 343-44. Adam and his posterity, in his doctrine of original sin, are portrayed as being one according to divine constitution. It is the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. *Ibid.*, 381, 393. We will discuss the imputation of Adam's sin more in the next section.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 389.

⁴² Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 9, *A History of the Work of Redemption*, ed. John Wilson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 135, 150, 152-53. For Edwards, only Christ's work can satisfy the demands of the law. *Ibid.*, 219, 257, 309. In *History*, Edwards says, "God saw need that the same world that was the stage of man's fall and ruin should also be the stage of his redemption. We read often of Christ's coming into the world to save sinners, and God's sending of him into the world." *Ibid.*, 296. In Edwards's theology, human depravity shows us the need of the mediatorial work of Christ. *Ibid.*, 124-26, 309-11.

⁴³ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 284, 306, 336, 340, 376.

determining power of the human will is problematic to Edwards.⁴⁴ Without understanding the importance of the relationship between fallen nature and human free will, self-determining power or works-righteousness promotes moralism in Christianity, as Edwards indicates in his works *Freedom of the Will* and *Original Sin*, as well as *Religious Affections*. If one rejects original sin and God's foreknowledge in salvation, one should eventually reject the necessity of Christ's atoning sacrifice and of Christ's righteousness, as well as God's free grace in salvation.⁴⁵ God's foreknowledge cannot be separated from Christ's righteousness in the doctrine of justification, since human beings are saved only by God's free grace. Edwards understands the importance of God's grace in terms of predestination or God's foreknowledge, following in the line of the Reformers.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Ibid., 194-95, 375, 376.

⁴⁵ In Edwards's theology, it must be noted that God's foreknowledge is very closely linked with the doctrine of atonement. Edwards, *Freedom*, 239, 248, 261-62, 286; Dorus Paul Rudisill, *The Doctrine of the Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and His Successors* (New York: Poseidon Books, 1971), 22-23; Gerstner, *Rational*, 2:429.

⁴⁶ God's foreknowledge is regarded as the most controversial issue between Calvinists and Arminians. Reinhold Seeberg, *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines: History of Doctrines in the Ancient Church*, vol. 1, trans. Charles E. Hay (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952; reprint, 1961), 338-53. Michael Jinkins shows his misunderstanding of Edwards's doctrine of atonement in his book *A Comparative Study in the Theology of Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and John McLeod Campbell*. Throughout this discussion, Jinkins fails to see the relationship between human depravity and God's grace in Edwards's theology. Michael Jinkins, *A Comparative Study in the Theology of Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and John McLeod Campbell: Atonement and the Character of God* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1993). Jinkins does not see the necessity of the atonement. Ibid., 11. Anri Morimoto's problematic treatment of Edwards's doctrine of salvation makes Edwards a kind of Roman Catholic theologian. Anri Morimoto, *Jonathan Edwards and the Catholic Vision of Salvation* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 1995). Richard Steele's interpretation is quite wrong, as he sees the Great Awakening and the Wesleyan Revival in the same line. Richard B. Steele, "Gracious Affection" and "True Virtue" according to Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1994), 158-59.

John Taylor's view of original sin, as a representative of Arminianism, is severely criticized by Edwards in *Original Sin*.⁴⁷ "Not only is there no need of Christ's redemption in order to deliver from any consequences of Adam's sin," Edwards says of Taylor's theology, "but also in order to perfect freedom from personal sin, and all the evil consequences."⁴⁸ Edwards's concern is that one might start without original sin, and then conclude that there is no need for the vicarious sacrifice of Christ for the guilt of people. Or one might start with the notion that man has autonomous power to obtain salvation, and conclude that he does not need God's efficacious grace through Jesus Christ by faith. Both of these conclusions are badly mistaken in Edwards's view.

Edwards emphasizes that the justification of the wicked consists in the sufficiency of Christ's merits through his atoning works by God's infinite and unmerited grace.⁴⁹ There is no *meritum de congruo* (congruous merit) in Edwards's doctrine of justification. For Edwards, the human will acts after God gives a new sense through the work of the Holy Spirit. Edwards argues that the divine Judge will not justify the wicked with the "imperfect righteousness" of human obedience, for the law of the Judge requires perfect obedience.⁵⁰ In God's eyes, the "perfect righteousness" of Christ is *reckoned* to the

⁴⁷ John Taylor was a leader of Arminianism in Edwards's day.

⁴⁸ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 356.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 113, 132, 147-48, 260. In Edwards's theology, Christ satisfies the demands of the law by offering himself as the once-for-all sacrifice. For Edwards, God paid the "infinite price" for the infinite guilt of God's children through the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Edwards, *History*, 137, 295, 304-5. The price is paid in full at the cross in order to satisfy God's justice. Ibid., 295, 306-7, 318, 321, 324, 331, 361. Edwards clearly supports the doctrine of limited atonement. Edwards, *Freedom*, 287, 433-34; Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 212, 236, 249, 302; Cherry, 113.

⁵⁰ Edwards, *Justification*, 68-69. To Edwards, the "law is the judge's rule." Ibid., 68.

account of the wicked through union with Christ. Justifying faith is the “very act of union” by the wicked.⁵¹

In Edwards’s understanding, God, through faith, unites Christ with the wicked and Christ becomes one with them. We should note that faith functions for Edwards to avoid the medieval idea of congruous merit, for he claims that it is “very different from a merit of congruity.”⁵² Edwards’s position is essentially in agreement with that of the Reformers.⁵³ Edwards’s doctrine of union between Christ and the wicked by faith emphasizes that human beings are saved by grace only on the condition that they are “in Christ” and that they are with Christ.⁵⁴ Under God’s sovereign grace, human beings are asked to participate in Christ’s vicarious work of salvation. In *Justification by Faith Alone*, Edwards explains the instrumental character of faith in salvation. Since there is no “inherent goodness” in human beings, faith is not a meritorious act in salvation.⁵⁵

And therefore, if faith is an instrument, it is more properly the instrument by which we receive Christ than the instrument by which we receive justification.... To be justified is to be approved by God as a proper subject of pardon, with a right to eternal life; and therefore, when it is said that we are justified by faith, what else can

⁵¹ Ibid., 16-17. Edwards uses John 6:35-40 and John 5:38-40 to explain justifying faith. For the justification of the wicked, through union with Christ, they can stand before the divine Judge. We will explore the relationship between faith and union in Edwards’s theology in the next section with more details.

⁵² Ibid., 19, 13.

⁵³ Edwards certainly denies the synergism of the semi-Pelagians. Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), 134-40.

⁵⁴ Edwards, *Justification*, 14-15. Edwards’s doctrine of justification by faith alone is very active and volitional in character. In order to establish union with Christ, the wicked have to accept God, because God treats them as “reasonable creatures, capable of acting and choosing.” Ibid., 18, 20, 88. However, the purpose of speaking the volitional act of the human will is not to generate the active role of the will in salvation, but it is to reflect on the *passive* character of faith in salvation. Such an act does not determine one’s salvation. It may well be that Edwards does not want to rule out human responsibility in the line of Calvin’s *free* election, as we saw before.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 13.

be understood by it than that faith is that by which we are rendered approvable, fitly so, and indeed, as the case stands, proper subjects of this benefit?⁵⁶

Unlike the medieval theologians, Edwards maintains that human righteousness is not a necessary condition for justification. The medieval theologians were convinced that men must cooperate with inherent righteousness. In order to cooperate with this inherent righteousness, human beings must exercise faith. In their doctrine of justification, faith works with inherent righteousness—that is, “righteousness that God actually *puts into us* and that changes us internally”—and then God declares us righteous.⁵⁷ In this sense, the medieval notion of *facere quod in se est* (doing what is in him) is completely denied by Edwards, since there is no human ability to obtain salvation because of the “infinite heinousness of sin.”⁵⁸ The mutual relation between faith and union in Edwards shows that it is a justifying faith by which the wicked unite themselves to Christ and “receive” Him.⁵⁹ Edwards combines his idea of faith with the notion of God’s free grace. To admit the wicked to “union with Christ” is an act of God’s “free and sovereign grace.”⁶⁰ It is not because human beings deserve to receive Christ’s righteousness, but because God accepts them as one with Christ as his own free act, based on the righteousness of Christ. It is saving grace through the work of the Holy Spirit. In *Religious Affections*, Edwards provides more details of the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion:

⁵⁶ Ibid., 12-13.

⁵⁷ Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989), 728. For Roman Catholicism, justification is not based “on imputed righteousness but on *infused* righteousness.” Ibid.

⁵⁸ Edwards, *Justification*, 23.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 16, 22.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 120.

And it is also evident from the Scripture, which often represents, that a saving belief of the reality and divinity of the things proposed and exhibited to us in the gospel, is from the Spirit of God's enlightening the mind, to have right apprehensions of the nature of those things, and so as it were unveiling things, or revealing them, and enabling the mind to view them and see them as they are.⁶¹

After a new spiritual sense is given to the wicked by the Holy Spirit, a spiritual understanding arises and then the mind of the wicked is convinced of the "great things of the gospel."⁶² Next, the human will acts to gain an *interest* in Christ and this act is accepted by God who unites Christ with sinners by the divine and gracious constitution. When this happens, the wicked are willing to depend on God. Edwards, however, strongly excludes the possibility of works-righteousness:

So that it is not by virtue of our interest in Christ and His merits that we first come into favor with God, according to this scheme; for we are in God's favor before we have any interest in those merits, in that we have an interest in those merits given as a fruit of God's favor for our own virtue. If our interest in Christ is the fruit of God's favor, then it cannot be the ground of it.... Indeed, neither salvation itself nor Christ the Savior is given as a reward for anything in man; they are not given as a reward for faith, nor for anything else of ours.⁶³

Thus, the legal union of Christ and his people is by faith alone, as well as a divine constitution which is established *sola gratia*. Salvation is God's work alone from the beginning to the end. "Faith unites to Christ" by God's act and is considered as "fitness" by God.⁶⁴ This "fitness" reminds us that God has abundant mercy for the wicked and that they become one with Christ by God's own gracious arrangement. This

⁶¹ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 296.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 297.

⁶³ Edwards, *Justification*, 85. See also *ibid.*, 109.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 96, 139.

fitness is not only a consequence of God's free grace, as is usually emphasized in

Edwards's theology, but is also in a certain sense a condition for grace in God's sight:

The wisdom of God in His constitutions doubtless appears much in the fitness and beauty of them, so that those things are established to be done that are fit to be done, and that those things are connected in His constitution that are agreeable to another. So God justifies a believer according to His revealed constitution, without doubt, because He sees something in this qualification that, as the case stands, renders it a fit thing that such a person should be justified—whether it is because faith is the instrument, or as it were, the hand by which He who has purchased justification is apprehended and accepted, or because it is the acceptance itself, or whatever else.⁶⁵

Edwards's statement on this idea of fitness by faith in God's sight is important because it shows the greatness of God's free grace in justification. The divine constitution of fitness is also significant because it tears down any self-confidence or self-righteousness when human beings come to Christ for salvation. No one can attract God's favor in salvation because of his goodness. Edwards's explanation strongly supports the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers. The justification of the wicked is not based on human righteousness, but on Christ's righteousness, for human righteousness cannot meet the demands of the law of the divine Judge. Since the wicked have no moral ability to obtain salvation by their own powers, they must turn their eyes away from themselves toward Christ.

Edwards, as we have seen, believes that as an act of God's own free grace, God gives a new spiritual sense as the strongest motive to the wicked. Through this activity (work) of the Holy Spirit, God helps them see the great blessings of the gospel. In this way, the wicked gain a *sensibleness* of faith and can decide and *act* to depend on God for

⁶⁵ Ibid., 12. See also *ibid.* 17-18, 66. For the legal constitution, see also Edwards, *Original Sin*, 112.

salvation.⁶⁶ In the divine Judge's legal constitution, the wicked are legally accepted and forensically declared as righteous. Justification for sinners is established by God's grace and performed by God alone. Without a new spiritual sense given by the Holy Spirit, the wicked are unable to have the *sensibleness* of faith. It seems that the Holy Spirit follows a certain order of operation in Edwards's theology. As Edwards breaks down the "successive steps" of the influence of the Holy Spirit into "two states," he describes a certain pattern of salvation:

As men that are saved are in two exceeding different states, first a state of condemnation, and then in a state of justification and blessedness; and as God in the works of the salvation of mankind, deals with them suitably to their intelligent rational nature; so it seems reasonable, and agreeable to God's wisdom, that men who are saved, should be in these two states sensibly, first, that they should sensibly to themselves, be in a dreadful misery, and so afterwards sensibly in a state of deliverance and happiness; and that they should be first sensible of their absolute extreme necessity, and afterwards of Christ's sufficiency and God's mercy through him.⁶⁷

This kind of formulation is important in Edwards's thought. It should be noted that his formulation for salvation is very different from many Puritan formulations of salvation. Edwards seeks to show that only our conviction of sin is necessary, but this necessary condition is not a sufficient ground for justification, but only a kind of fitness in God's eyes for the justification. Edwards emphasizes that salvation is possible only through the preparation of the Holy Spirit. He denies the idea of preparationism, that

⁶⁶ Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 17, *Sermons & Discourses*, 1730-1733, ed. Mark Valeri (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 213.

⁶⁷ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 152. In his letter to Gillespie, Edwards also gives a similar pattern: "It is God's manner first to awaken their consciences, and to bring 'em to reflect upon themselves, and to bring 'em to feel their own calamity which they have brought upon themselves by so departing from God (by which an end is put to their carelessness and security), and again earnestly and carefully to seek God's face before they find him, and before God restores the comfortable and joyful sense of his favor; and I think this is abundantly evident both by Scripture and experience." *Ibid.*, 508.

sinner might accelerate the process of conversion, maintaining that conversion necessarily follows prevenient grace, that is, God's absolute sovereign grace.⁶⁸ In the process of the preparatory works led by God, human beings respond to their spiritual understanding given by the Holy Spirit and the will *voluntarily* decides to depend on God's grace.⁶⁹ Edwards does not intend to establish either a certain "order" or a certain "rule" which determines how God works in the process:⁷⁰

We have no certain rule to determine how far God's own spirit may go in those operations and convictions which in themselves are not spiritual and saving, and yet the person that is that subject of them, never be converted, but fall short of salvation at last.... The manner of the Spirit's proceeding in them that are born of the Spirit, is very often exceeding mysterious and unsearchable: we, as it were, hear the sound of it, the effect of it is discernable; but no man can tell whence it came, or whither it went.⁷¹

His emphasis is on the variety of conversion experiences, even though there is the sharp distinction between a saving grace and a sanctifying grace. But this formulation neither makes human works a sufficient ground for salvation, nor weakens the place of the influences of the Holy Spirit in salvation. Edwards argues that no one can prepare for salvation without the influence of the Holy Spirit. In *Religious Affections*, Edwards argues that salvation is made possible by the preparatory work of the Holy Spirit through

⁶⁸ For Edwards, the prevenient grace helps the wicked proceed from the sinful nature to the efficacious call of the gospel. In this soteriology, preachers need to preach the law of God as well as the gospel. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards: Great Awakening*, ed. C. C. Goen, vol. 4 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 389-94; Edwards, *Justification*, 125. Cf. Allen C. Guelzo, *Edwards on the Will: A Century of American Theological Debate* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989), 123.

⁶⁹ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 119-20, 278. Cf. R. C. Sproul, *Willing to Believe* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 112, 165.

⁷⁰ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 159.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 159-61.

God's grace alone. God's preparatory work, not an autonomous human will, is decisive for the justification of the wicked.

Edwards's doctrine of *forensic* justification contains a conception of fitness by divine constitution in order to justify the relationship between faith and union with Christ.⁷² The turning act of the wicked to Christ with loving desire and submission is faith in Edwards's thought. In *Justification by Faith Alone*, Edwards discards the Arminian notion of works-righteousness in salvation by saying that after the Fall, the acts of human beings cannot be acceptable to God without the work of the Holy Spirit, for their acts are always imperfect in God's sight.⁷³ Thus, Edwards's explanation of faith being fitness to the divine Judge is developed from the inability of fallen human beings:

Because our good deeds and virtuous acts themselves are in a sense corrupt and the hatefulness of the corruption of them, if we are beheld as we are in ourselves or separate from Christ, infinitely outweighs the loveliness of the good that is in them. So that if no other sin is considered but that which attends the act of virtue itself, the loveliness vanishes into nothing in comparison to it. And therefore the virtue must pass for nothing, outside of Christ.

Not only are our best duties defiled—in being attended with the exercises of sin and corruption which precede, follow, and are intermingled with them—but even the holy acts themselves, and the gracious exercises of the godly, are defective.⁷⁴

Edwards makes it clear that the act of faith does not deserve God's grace in salvation, even though God responds to it with his constitution of the believer's union with Christ. Edwards's view of faith is deeply rooted both in the doctrine of original sin

⁷² In God's legal constitution, the divine Judge does not justify the wicked, unless God accepts and considers them as one with Christ for the imputation of Christ's righteousness. This is a consequence of God's gracious work in justification, by which God imputes Christ's righteousness to sinners by faith.

⁷³ Edwards, *Justification*, 48-49, 59.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 105.

and in the idea of *sola gratia* in salvation.⁷⁵ Edwards's conviction that human merits are unacceptable to God due to their imperfect and sinful nature is essential to his view that God does not see the act of faith as sufficient merit at all to satisfy his justice. In this sense, salvation is God's free gift to his children. Thus, the forensic declaration of justification is based on the Judge's rule over sinners with his unconditional love:

A person is said to be justified when he is approved by God as free from the guilt of sin and its deserved punishment, and as having that righteousness belonging to him that entitles him to the reward of life. That we should take the word in such a sense—and understand it as the judge's accepting a person as having both a negative and positive righteousness belonging to him, and looking on him therefore not only as free from any obligation to punishment, but also as just and righteous, and so entitled to a positive reward.⁷⁶

Edwards often speaks in ways that suggest that faith is a condition in a certain sense, and this must be understood in relation to his idea of fitness to God's standard of qualification for the imputation of Christ's righteousness.⁷⁷ In God's judgment, faith is a condition in the sense that it becomes an acceptable *fitness* to his own legal system.

Edwards is determined to say that saving faith must produce the fruits of faith such as "love to God, love to our brethren, forgiveness."⁷⁸ In other words, after God's legal declaration of justification by faith alone through Christ alone, the "acts of evangelical obedience" must follow in the Christian life.⁷⁹ Edwards's explanation is exact and carefully considered. The fruits of a saving faith are conditional evidences for the

⁷⁵ Ibid., 58-59.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 5.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 8-10.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 9.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 96, 100-101.

justification of the wicked, proving God's saving grace. To be sure that his point of view is understood, he answers the question, "What is the nature of true religion?" in *Religious Affections*.⁸⁰ God's saving grace in justification must be "perfected or finished in its work or fruit" in sanctification.⁸¹ In *Religious Affections*, Edwards shows the twelve signs of the gracious work of the Holy Spirit in salvation.⁸² The most important sign of God's *saving grace* is the twelfth sign, which is the "exercise and fruit in Christian practice."⁸³ Christians must show the fruits of a *saving faith* as the proof of the saving grace of God through the works of the Holy Spirit:

Holy practice is the proper evidence of a saving faith. 'Tis evident that the apostle James speaks of works, as what does eminently justify faith, or (which is the same thing) justify the professors of faith, and vindicate and manifest the sincerity of their profession, not only to the world, but to their own consciences: as is evident by the instance he gives of Abraham (Jas. 2:21-24). And in verses 20 and 26, he speaks of the practical and working nature of faith, as the very life and soul of it.⁸⁴

For Edwards, good works in James are the necessary manifestation and evidence of saving faith.⁸⁵ Christians must exercise saving faith in their lives to show the evidences of God's saving grace. The point here is that Edwards is not repeating what the Roman Catholic Church has taught, but is agreeing with the formula of the Reformers that the

⁸⁰ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 84.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 435.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 89. In *Religious Affections*, Edwards clearly states that we are not justified by these twelve signs. *Ibid.*, 455-57, 459.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 383-461. Cf. *Ibid.*, 85, 450.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 445. Cf. *Ibid.*, 435-36, 446-47.

⁸⁵ Edwards, *Justification*, 135-44. When the Holy Spirit enters into us, love not only for God but also for men "enters." "Love the Sum of All Virtue," in Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 8, *Ethical Writings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 132-33. Edwards's fifteen sermons on "Charity and Its Fruits" clearly show that love is not a necessary condition for justification, but a fruit of saving faith (Gal 5:6). *Ibid.*, 123-397.

justifying act of God must be shown through the fruits of Christians. Edwards is clear that justification for the wicked *sola fide*—*sola gratia* means nothing apart from Christ alone. Edwards's major concern in *Religious Affections* is to show not only that the wicked have faith in Christ and are justified *extra nos*, but also that the fruits of a saving faith are the evidence of justification. Edwards distinguishes two kinds of grace—saving grace for the sinner and sanctifying grace for the saint, but they are not separated or unrelated, for God preserves the saving faith of the saint through the “gracious leading of the Holy Spirit.”⁸⁶ The righteousness of Christ is not only forensically imputed to sinners, but also participated in by those sinners in their good deeds through faith, effected by the influences of the Holy Spirit. Thus, works in James are not only the perfection of a saving faith, but also the consequence of God's saving grace in Edwards's theology.

Edwards challenges the church and theology of his day with the gospel of *forensic* justification and stands against the rise of moralism in Christianity. Certainly, in Edwards's observation, the truth of the gospel in America had been weakened since the time of the Enlightenment and the doctrine of justification had been damaged by moralism. Edwards's goal in setting forth the doctrine of justification against Arminianism was to protect the core of the gospel in America. Edwards describes the righteousness of Christ as God's gift, which can be neither produced nor earned by human righteousness. With his doctrine of justification by faith alone, Edwards aimed to praise God's grace and the greatness of the gospel. To Edwards, our ability to love God and neighbor comes only from God through the work of the Holy Spirit. Edwards rejects any form of *moralism*, either in the doctrine of justification or in the doctrine of

⁸⁶ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 100, 133, 138, 146, 275, 281-82.

sanctification. The nature of true religion always presupposes God as the Author of Christianity in Edwards's theology. Arminians, who deny that God is the Author of salvation and who consider human beings as the author of salvation, are severely criticized by Edwards.

2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

Since the Reformation, the doctrine of *justification by faith alone* has been known to Protestants as the article by which the church stands or falls. The Reformers emphasized the word *alone* in the doctrine. As we have seen, Edwards reaffirms the formula of the Reformers that *sola fide* is the article by which we distinguish a true from a false doctrine of justification. It is the doctrine of justification by God's grace alone through faith alone because of Christ's righteousness alone. What is the nature of justification? Edwards declares that justification is *forensic* in nature.⁸⁷ But what does Edwards mean by *forensic*?

The doctrine of justification refers *strictly* to a legal declaration by which God the divine Judge declares the wicked righteous because he sees Christ's perfect righteousness in them. When Edwards speaks of this *forensic* justification, he understands a *forensic* constitution in the relationship between Adam and his posterity.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ Edwards, *Justification*, 67.

⁸⁸ The most important verse in the doctrine of imputation is Romans 5:19. The verse clearly shows the *forensic* element of Adam's imputed sin to his posterity (αυαρτωλοι κατεσταθη: were "constituted" sinners) and of Christ's imputed righteousness to the sinner (δικαιοι καταστησανται: were "constituted" righteous). Certainly, in this verse "guilt" is implicated by the judicial sentence of the sovereign God. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. III, ed. Gerhard Kittel & Gerhard Friedrich, vol. III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974), 444-46; *Walter Bauer's A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, rev. William F. Arndt &

According to Edwards, in *Justification by Faith Alone*, God proves to be the divine Judge, as the Lawgiver who places men in the divine court:

It is absolutely necessary that, in order for a sin to be justified, the righteousness of some other should be reckoned to his account; for it is declared that the person justified is looked upon (in himself) ungodly. But God neither will nor can justify a person without righteousness; for justification is manifestly a forensic term, as the word is used in Scripture, and a judicial thing, or the act of a judge.... To say that God does not justify the sinner without sincere, though imperfect, obedience does not help the case; for an imperfect righteousness before a judge is no righteousness.⁸⁹

Significantly, the original sin of Adam prevents the divine Judge from justifying men on the basis of their righteousness. No one can avoid the punishment of God's wrath without the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Edwards often refers to the law as the Judge's "rule," so the wicked should be placed on trial, for God judges always according to his truth.⁹⁰ To Edwards, God's punishment is "the terrors of God's holy law." Under

F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 390; *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 2, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1994), 225-26. D. A. Carson rejects the nonimputation of Christ's righteousness in N. T. Wright and Robert Gundry, D.A. Carson, "The Vindication of Imputation," in Mark Husbands and Daniel J. Treier, eds., *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates* (Downers, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 46-48. Speaking of the *forensic* nature of imputation, Murray rightly states that Adam's imputed sin to his posterity is "both *peccatum alienum* and *peccatum proprium*" and that "neither aspect must be stressed to the exclusion of the other." John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1959), 86-88. He makes clear its relation to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner:

If we follow this direction of thought [the *forensic* solidarity (union) with Christ] and apply it our union with Adam we may properly find that although "constituted sinners" (Rom. 5:19) cannot be made to express any more than the forensic relation to Adam's sin yet solidarity with Adam implies more by way of involvement in sin than that expressed in forensic terms. *Ibid.*, 89.

Edwards also believes that the imputation of sin is just as *forensic* or *legal* as the imputation of righteousness. He claims that Romans 5:18-19 clearly shows the *forensic* element of Adam's imputed sin to his posterity. Therefore, Adam's sin is *legally* "counted" or "reckoned" or "transferred" or "imputed" to his posterity in his doctrine of imputation. Edwards, *Original Sin*, 251-61, 306-52, 389-90, 403-404; Edwards, *Justification*, 73-76. We will discuss it more.

⁸⁹ Edwards, *Justification*, 67-68. For the justification of the wicked, they are "legally one or accepted as one" with Christ by the divine Judge. In Edwards's theology of union with Christ, the wicked become partakers of Christ's works in justification. In Christ, the sins of the wicked are removed and they are *forensically* or *legally* "pronounced innocent." *Ibid.*, 69, 70, 137, 142.

the law, God cannot justify us without his righteousness because of our imperfect obedience. Now Edwards, like Luther, recognizes that the *terrors* of the law show the necessity of Christ's redemptive work.⁹¹ Because of our inability to obtain salvation, Edwards's *forensic* justification is closely linked to *sola fide–sola gratia*, for it is God's gracious *legal* declaration of forgiveness based on the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Edwards counts the law as a part of God's redemptive work through Christ. And the purpose of the law is to highlight the fact that human beings can be saved only *sola fide–sola gratia*.⁹²

What is the ground of justification in Edwards's theology? On what basis does God declare the wicked righteous? Edwards acknowledges that the righteousness of Christ is the sole ground of justification.⁹³ At this point, the righteousness of "some other" by which the wicked are justified is *extra nos*, that is, *alien* righteousness.⁹⁴ For Edwards, God can declare the wicked righteous only if they possess the external righteousness of God. How do the wicked possess it? Are the wicked justified by the

⁹⁰ Ibid., 68.

⁹¹ For Edwards, the law does not guarantee our salvation. It is only a *schoolmaster* which leads the wicked to Christ. Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 13, *Miscellanies*, ed. Thomas Schafer (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 465; Edwards, *History*, 180, 308-309, 312.

⁹² Edwards, *History*, 168-69. In *The Great Awakening*, Edwards writes that by the Holy Spirit, after hearing the terrors of God's law, the wicked recognize God's grace and depend on it. In salvation, this hopelessness of the wicked is reaffirmed in *The Great Awakening*. Edwards emphasizes the importance of God's sovereignty in soteriology. Edwards, *Great Awakening*, 168. See also *ibid.* 163-68, 265-66. Only by God's gracious work through the Holy Spirit, can regeneration be produced in the heart of the wicked. In this sense, salvation comes solely from God.

⁹³ Edwards, *Justification*, 73-74, 109-10; Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 455, 459; Edwards, *Original Sin*, 340.

⁹⁴ Edwards, *Justification*, 67. It is a justification by the imputation of an *alien* righteousness. Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 91; John Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 122.

imputation of Christ's righteousness or by the righteousness of Christ that becomes *inherent* in the wicked by the infusion of God's grace? Edwards denies the medieval notion that the wicked possess an *inherent righteousness*, which then becomes the ground for justification:

And by that righteousness being imputed to us is meant nothing other than that the righteousness of Christ is accepted for us, and admitted instead of that *perfect inherent righteousness which ought to be in ourselves*. Christ's perfect obedience shall be *reckoned to our account* so that we shall have the benefit of it, as though we had performed it ourselves.... The Scripture uses the word "impute" in this sense: for *reckoning anything belonging to any person to another person's account*.⁹⁵

Edwards understands "to be imputed" to mean "to be reckoned."⁹⁶ His statement clearly shows that righteousness comes only from *outside of us*. Thus, Edwards sees the Arminian's treatment of the imputation of Christ's righteousness as "inconsistent" with the doctrine of justification.⁹⁷ Edwards goes on to say: "They [Arminians] talk of Christ's merits as much as anybody, and yet deny the imputation of Christ's positive righteousness. What should there be that anyone should merit or deserve anything by,

⁹⁵ Edwards, *Justification*, 63 (italics added). Edwards quotes Philem. 18, Rom. 4:6, and Rom. 5:23 for this discussion. Edwards's synthetic view of justification is that God legally declares the wicked righteous only on the basis of the imputed righteousness of Christ by faith alone. Like the Reformed doctrine of justification, Edwards distinguishes his from the medieval notion of justification and the Arminian doctrine of justification. In his view, our justification rests on a *legal* declaration issued by God on the basis of God's declaration that the divine Judge is legally *reckoning* the righteousness of Christ to our account. But the medieval doctrine of justification also seems to maintain that justification is based on God's legal declaration. What is the difference between them? The medieval notion of legal declaration shows that God declares us righteous when we are righteous. Medieval justification is based on the infusion of Christ's righteousness. In the Roman Catholic analytical view, God declares us righteous when he sees internal change in us effected by inherent righteousness. But in Edwards's synthetic view, God declares us righteous as he imputes the righteousness of Christ through union with Christ by faith. While the ground of justification in Edwards's theology comes from outside of us (*extra nos*: only from the righteousness of Christ), the Roman Catholic ground of justification basically comes from inside of us (*facere quod in se est*—doing what is in him).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

besides righteousness or goodness?... that righteousness is reckoned to our account so that we have the benefit of it, or which is the same thing, it is imputed to us.”⁹⁸

Likewise Edwards argues that in Scripture justification never refers to an infusion of righteousness; it must always be understood as a *forensic* term. When Edwards speaks of *forensic* justification, he means a legal declaration made by God that is based on the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the wicked, not on the *inherent* righteousness in human beings. As Edwards clearly stays in the line of the Reformers, he thinks that in God’s sight a believer is seen as “a member of Christ, and clothed with His righteousness.”⁹⁹ For Edwards, Christ’s righteousness becomes *legally* our righteousness, as we are “reckoned” or “counted” righteous by imputation. The ground of justification remains solely the imputed righteousness of Christ. It is by the external righteousness of Christ *alone* in Edwards’s theology that the wicked are declared to be righteous by God in Christ Jesus.

What is the means of imputation, by which God links the righteousness of Christ to the wicked? Does God require a trust in the righteousness of Christ *alone* as the ground of justification? How do the benefits of Christ’s work become the believer’s? Edwards makes a crucial point that was often overlooked in the eighteenth century in America. He speaks of two federal heads in the doctrine of imputation. First, Edwards presents Adam’s federal headship in a *forensic* sense in order to show the necessity of Christ’s satisfying work for the wicked. Secondly, believers are *legally* constituted as members of

⁹⁸ Ibid., 82-83.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 109.

the federal Head who is Jesus Christ.¹⁰⁰ Through this relationship between Christ, the federal Head, and God's children, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to them by faith.

Edwards describes Adam's federal headship this way:

I have now particularly considered the account which Moses gives us in the beginning of the Bible, of our first parents, and God's dealing with them, the *constitution he established with them*, their transgression, and what followed if we consider how plainly and undeniably *his posterity are included in the sentence of death pronounced on Adam after his fall*, founded on the foregoing threatening; and consider the curse denounced on the ground for his sake, and for his and his posterity's sorrow.¹⁰¹

Edwards often uses the word *constitution* to elucidate a "real connection" between Adam's sin and his posterity.¹⁰² What does he mean by "constitution"? The term *constitution* basically refers to the "covenant" of God in the *forensic* relationship between Adam and his posterity. The *constitution* implies God's established *order*. "In relation to the covenant or constitution established with him," God sees Adam and his posterity as *one*.¹⁰³ In the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin, all human beings are counted as *one* with Adam by God's covenant or constitution.¹⁰⁴ This *forensic* union of Adam and

¹⁰⁰ Edwards finds the divine constitution of this federal headship easy to understand. Edwards, *Original Sin*, 260, 389, 390-412. See also *ibid.*, 153. Unfortunately, George Hutchinson does not pick up the importance of the two federal headships in Edwards. Hutchinson, *The Problem of Original Sin*, 12-13. But John Murray correctly maintains that Paul, in Rom 5:12-21, draws the analogy between the two phases of Adam's and Christ's imputation. John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968; reprint, 1984), 178-210; Murray, *Imputation*, 76.

¹⁰¹ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 260 (italics added). Cf. *Ibid.*, 242, 253, 260, 383; Edwards, "Miscellanies," 387-89; Sproul, *Willing*, 147-55, 162-63. Edwards's doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin clearly links him to the view of the Reformers.

¹⁰² Edwards, *Original Sin*, 257-61, 386-87. Edwards also uses phrases such as "an established order," "the established course of nature," and "the established order of nature" to show the connection between Adam's sin and his posterity. *Ibid.*, 385-86. It is "a constituted union [oneness] of the branches with the root" or "the established union." *Ibid.*, 390-91. For Edwards, it is also "God's revealed constitution." Edwards, *Justification*, 12.

¹⁰³ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 389.

his posterity becomes not only the ground of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, but also the ground of the necessity of Christ's righteousness to sinners. If there is no sin, Christ's righteousness is not necessary.¹⁰⁵ In this sense, the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin is a vital connection when considering the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Edwards affirms that Adam's sin has been *legally* imputed to everyone:

But the depravity of nature, remaining an established principle in the heart of a child of Adam, and as exhibited in after-operations, is a consequence and punishment of the first apostacy thus participated, and brings a new guilt.... The first depravity of heart, and the imputation of that sin, are both consequences of that established union: but yet in such order, that the evil disposition is *first*, and the charge of guilt consequent; as it was in the case of Adam himself.¹⁰⁶

For Edwards, *all* human beings are united with Adam not only *biologically* but also *legally* in God's sight, and thus become partakers in the consequences of Adam's sin through this legal union.¹⁰⁷ With our *legal* union with Adam, God is *legally* reckoning, counting, transferring, or imputing Adam's sin to our account. It is a covenantal relationship, which is established by God. It is also a divine channel by which Adam's sin

¹⁰⁴ It is useful for us to see how Paul Helm finds Edwards's theology as a covenant theology. Introduction to Edwards's *Treatise on Grace*, 14-17; Conrad Cherry, "The Puritan Notion of the Covenant in Jonathan Edwards' Doctrine of Faith," *Church History* 34 (1965): 328-41. Edwards often uses the word *covenant* in his *A History of the Work of Redemption*. Edwards, *History*, 114-15, 133, 135, 150, 151, 152-53, 16, 160-65.

¹⁰⁵ According to Edwards, we must see the relationship between Christ and his people in light of the relationship between Adam and his posterity. John Murray rightly criticizes the Pelagian idea of original sin, which destroys Paul's doctrine of justification. Murray, *Imputation*, 12.

¹⁰⁶ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 391-95.

¹⁰⁷ After his explanation of the imputation of Adam's sin, Edwards concludes: "And thus all things, with relation to evil disposition, guilt, pollution and depravity, would exist, in the same order and dependence, in each branch [Adam's posterity], as in the root [Adam]." *Ibid.*, 391-92. God the divine Judge sees "Adam's sin in all." *Ibid.*, 345-46.

is imputed to us.¹⁰⁸ In *Original Sin*, Edwards lays the foundation of justification with the doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin. If one fails to see this significant union between Adam and his posterity in the doctrine of the imputed sin of Adam, he will fail to see the necessity of Christ's satisfaction in Edwards's theology.

After his analysis of the imputation of Adam's sin, Edwards argues that Arminianism is a result of "the fall," which can be called the *Arminian apostasy* because of its denial of the constituted union with Adam.¹⁰⁹ The issue of original sin by the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin is very significant in Christianity because it forms a strong *fortress* against Arminianism, Pelagianism, and deism. Edwards thinks that the doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin is closely related to God's sovereign "grace, election, redemption, conversion, the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit, the nature of saving faith, perseverance of the saints, and other principles" in Christianity.¹¹⁰ To distort the relationship between Adam and his posterity does severe damage to all these doctrines in Christianity. The denial of the imputation of Adam's sin would be a threat to the gospel because it is a struggle about understanding the necessity of Christ's righteousness, which is at the core of the gospel. Therefore, the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin is a significant doctrine in the gospel of Christianity, for its rejection leads to distorting the core of the gospel, which is the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

¹⁰⁸ Some would view Edwards's doctrine of original sin in terms of mediate imputation or place Edwards in between the mediate and immediate imputation of Adam's sin. However, I strongly believe that Edwards sees it as the *immediate* imputation of Adam's sin. John Gerstner, *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 2 (Powhatan, VA: Berea Publications, 1992), 322-28, 331-35; George P. Hutchinson, *The Problem of Original Sin in American Presbyterian Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), 12, 94, 103; Murray, *Imputation*, 42-70.

¹⁰⁹ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 420.

As for the federal headship of Christ, the question remains: On what basis are the wicked justified? For the imputation of Christ's righteousness, Edwards sees a *legal* union between Christ and God's children. This *legal* union is the ground of justification in Edwards's theology:

What is real in the union between Christ and His people is the foundation of what is *legal*; that is, it is something really in them and between them, *uniting* them. That is the ground of the suitableness of their *being accounted as one by the Judge*.... He should accept the satisfaction and merits of the one [Christ] for the other [His people], as if these were their own satisfaction and merits.¹¹⁰

In God's gracious eyes, *on account of faith* this *legal* union is "fit and congruous" for believers.¹¹² It is Edwards's conviction that in justification everything that comes into union with Christ is totally God's work, for union with Christ is not "a reward for faith."¹¹³ The essential idea of faith in Edwards's theology is that by faith God the supreme Judge sees it *fit* that Christ and his people are one.¹¹⁴ This legal union between Christ and God's children as a divine constitution is similar to the legal union of Adam and his posterity. The *legal* union with Christ is the only way by which God declares the wicked just. Without this gracious union, the atoning work of Christ for sinners would be "in vain."¹¹⁵ Without this established covenant, sinners cannot be actually and finally justified by God. At the core of the gospel, Edwards connects the *legal* union between

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 376 (italics not added). Cf. Ibid., 375-79. Edwards criticizes them by saying "if" they can remain *invincible* with their doctrine. Ibid. Cf. Ibid., 157, 183, 186, 359; Edwards, *Justification*, 82-83.

¹¹¹ Edwards, *Justification*, 18 (italics added).

¹¹² Ibid., 19.

¹¹³ Ibid., 17-18.

¹¹⁴ Edwards explains that God requires this act of faith in order for us to be accepted by the divine Judge. Ibid., 18.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 88-89. The wicked must be "in Christ" to be justified by the divine Judge. Ibid.

Christ and believers with the idea of the federal headship of Christ over his people.¹¹⁶

Edwards uses the metaphor of a tree to illustrate this *legal* union of Christ and God's children, as well as God's grace:

Grace is introduced among the race of mankind by *a new establishment*; not on the foot of the original establishment of God, as the Head of the natural world, and Author of the first creation; but by constitution of a vastly higher kind; wherein Christ is made the root of the tree, whose branches are his spiritual seed and he is the head of the new creation.¹¹⁷

In this statement, Edwards shows the idea of *sola gratia* in the Reformers. The *new establishment* of God is the cornerstone of God's grace to sinners, so that they can come to Christ and be *legally* justified through this union. Edwards emphasizes that God is the sole Author of this *new establishment* for the justification of sinners. It was originally "settled and limited by divine wisdom" only.¹¹⁸ It is interesting to note that Edwards uses the same metaphor of the tree for the two federal headships.

Does Edwards believe that Christ's righteousness is available to *all* human beings through this legal union? Are we *all* qualified for the imputation of Christ's righteousness through this *legal* union, just as Adam's sin is imputed to us *all* through a legal union? In other words, is everyone involved in the imputation of Christ's righteousness as it is in the legal union of Adam and all mankind? Edwards distinguishes between the *legal* union of Adam and his posterity and the *legal* union of Christ and God's children. Edwards's doctrine of salvation distinguishes between the scope of the imputation of Adam's sin and the scope of the imputation of Christ's righteousness:

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 65, 113, 117. Christ is called our *Surety* or *Representative* in Edwards. Ibid, 72.

¹¹⁷ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 386. See also Edwards, *Justification*, 15 (legal union).

¹¹⁸ Edwards, *Original Sin*, 386.

God has the actual salvation or redemption of a certain number in his proper absolute design, and of a certain number only.... God pursues a proper design of the salvation of the elect in giving Christ to die.... And indeed such a particularity and limitation of redemption will as infallibly follow from the doctrine of God's foreknowledge, as from that of the decree.¹¹⁹

For Edwards, the *legal* union of Christ and God's children is established by God's own wisdom. And the scope of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is limited by God's absolute decree. By God's own constitution, he establishes the relationship between Christ and his children so that the righteousness of Christ can be legally imputed or transferred to them. By this special union, they are connected with each other through God's "absolute design" by a *legal* union. This *legal* union of Jesus Christ with God's children seems to be very similar to the relationship between Adam and his posterity, since Edwards uses the same metaphor of the tree to describe each one. But the *forensic* imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is different from the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to sinners, for Christ is not the federal Head of *all* human beings, while Adam becomes the representative of *all* mankind. The benefits of Christ's righteousness are *only* for God's children who have been *justified by faith alone through God's grace alone because of Christ's work alone* in Edwards's doctrine of salvation. The *legal* imputation of Christ's righteousness is available only for those who come to benefit from Christ's work by God's foreknowledge and who are justified by God's *legal* declaration. In Edwards's doctrine of justification, the atoning work of Christ is not for all, but only for God's people. He echoes Calvin's position by saying that "Christ in some

¹¹⁹ Edwards, *Freedom*, 435. God's foreknowledge, as we saw before, is closely related to limited atonement in Edwards's theology. *Ibid.*, 239, 258-69, 434.

sense may be said to *die for all*, and to redeem all visible Christians, yea, the whole world by his death.”¹²⁰

Edwards shows that the scope of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is limited to the elect. The initial assumption of Edwards’s soteriology is that God’s grace is given only to a limited group of people. The scope of the *legal* union is definitely an area in which there is a great deal of contrast between the thought of Edwards and the thought of Arminians like John Taylor.¹²¹ The Arminians would support universal atonement, while Edwards advocates limited atonement. Does Edwards’s soteriology lead him to reject the role of the human will since God establishes the way of salvation? Does God naturally transfer Christ’s righteousness to us? Who is qualified to receive the imputation of Christ’s righteousness? For Edwards, *sola fide* is an essential and necessary element of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness and of the gospel.¹²²

Faith, in Edwards’s theology, must be exercised to be “in Christ,” which is the *ground* of having God’s “satisfaction and merits belong to” Christ. Prevenient grace must come before faith, but our faith is the qualification for “our being united to Christ” and then “our having Christ’s merits and benefits belonging to us.”¹²³ In this sense, faith and justification must be distinguished in Edwards’s theology, but justifying faith is involved

¹²⁰ Ibid., 435; Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 347. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.11.11-2, 2.13.2.

¹²¹ In *Original Sin*, Edwards criticizes the Arminian views of Dr. Taylor as a representative of Arminianism.

¹²² Edwards, *Justification*, 15. We discussed the relationship between faith and free will in the previous section, so we are not going to give details on it here. See also *ibid.*, 9-12.

¹²³ Ibid., 15.

in our justification as a *legal* ground between Christ and God's children.¹²⁴ A profound change takes place at this point by God's forensic declaration, effected by faith *alone* through the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness *alone*. In our previous discussion, we saw that Edwards has a synthetic view of justification. He clearly affirms that faith is the instrumental cause in justification. The legal union of Christ and the wicked becomes effective when they are *in Christ*:

God will neither look to Christ's merits as ours, nor grant His benefits to us till we are *in Christ*; nor will He look upon us as *being in Him without an active union of our hearts and souls to Him*, because He is a wise being and delights in order, and not in confusion, and that things should be together or asunder according to their nature.¹²⁵

For Edwards, this *legal* union by faith alone is given as a "testimony" of God's love. God has given us the *legal* union by which he sees the "beauty of the act of faith" through God's eyes.¹²⁶ Edwards thus is emphatic that the legal union and *sola fide* are deeply rooted in *sola gratia*. Edwards says that faith "includes the whole act of union with Christ as a Savior."¹²⁷ But what is meant by "includes"? Does faith decide to be imputed with Christ's righteousness? If Edwards considers "the entire active uniting of the soul" by faith alone to be necessary for justification, while emphasizing the idea of *sola gratia* in the legal union, it would seem somewhat confusing. In order for the believer to unite with Christ, he has to accept him according to the divine constitution.

¹²⁴ In Edwards's thought, faith presupposes God's grace, but God's grace becomes effective only because of the believer's union with Christ. Through union with Christ by faith alone, God unconditionally accepts the wicked and declares them righteous through the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The *forensic* aspect of justification is twofold: "the acceptance and approbation" of the divine Judge and "the manifestation of that approbation by a sentence declared" by the divine Judge. *Ibid.*, 139.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 20 (italics added).

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

Edwards uses the metaphor of *marriage* to explain further the correlation between divine constitution and the role of faith in a believer: “When a man offers himself to a woman in marriage, he does not give himself to her as a reward for her receiving him in marriage. Her receiving him is not considered as a worthy deed in her for which he rewards her by giving himself to her.”¹²⁸

Edwards seeks to develop the view that the believer takes part in this *legal* union. In order to accomplish this, Edwards sets up an idea of this union: “But it is by her receiving him that the union is made by which she has him for her husband. Her receiving him constitutes the union itself.”¹²⁹ The woman’s act of joining is no more than an acknowledgment of the truth that is already prepared by the bridegroom—that is, Jesus Christ. In this respect, Gerhard D. Forde is correct to say, “We see here the deepest reason for the theology of justification by faith alone, justification by the divine unconditional decree, indeed, by divine predestination.”¹³⁰ Edwards does acknowledge that the acceptance of the woman is nothing but an acceptance of the gracious covenant of God—that the bridegroom already considers her as his wife. Regarding this, Edwards says:

If a beggar should be offered any great and precious gift, but (as soon as it is offered) should trample it under his feet, it might show him to be unworthy to have it. Or if a malefactor should have his pardon offered him, so that he might be freed from execution, and should only scoff at it, his pardon might be refused him since he

¹²⁷ Ibid., 22.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 85.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 85.

¹³⁰ Gerhard D. Forde, *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 74.

is unworthy of it, even though, if he had received it, he would not have had it for his worthiness, or as being recommended to it by his virtue.¹³¹

It is true that the voluntary acts of the wicked lead them to *forensic* union with Christ, to be a beneficiary of the work of Jesus Christ, but “admitting a soul to a union with Christ is an act of free and sovereign grace” to Edwards.¹³² Under God’s free and sovereign grace, the wicked are *legally constituted* to be voluntary partakers in the work of Christ by faith alone. Like beggars or malefactors, the wicked are *unworthy* to receive the imputed righteousness of Christ only by the acceptance of God’s sovereign and prevenient grace through faith alone. But the believer’s voluntary act receives a saving union with Christ. Thus, sovereign grace is confirmed by the act of faith. In this sense, the righteousness of Christ is a gift of God. And the *forensic* imputation of Christ’s righteousness *sola gratia* excludes the act of faith as the ground of justification. In defending the Reformation doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ alone, Edwards fights against the human autonomy of Arminianism. Edwards believes that faith has *influence* for the justification of the wicked only under God’s “gracious frame.”¹³³ Edwards recognizes the necessity of faith in the *forensic* imputation of Christ’s righteousness, but he also sees the uniting with Christ that the Holy Spirit effects through faith alone. In speaking of union with Christ, Edwards attacks those who deny the saving grace of God in salvation:

’Tis very true that all grace and goodness in the hearts of the saints is entirely from God: and they are universally and immediately dependent on him for it. But yet these persons are mistaken, as to the manner of God’s communicating himself and

¹³¹ Edwards, *Justification*, 120-21.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 120.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 86-89; Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 176, 222, 296.

his Holy Spirit, in imparting saving grace to the soul. He gives his Spirit to be united to the faculties of the soul, and to dwell there after the manner of a principle of nature; so that the soul, in being indued with grace, is indued with a new nature: but nature is an abiding thing.¹³⁴

Edwards sees legal union with Christ as taking place in or through the Holy Spirit alone. Even though he also says that “faith unites to Christ,” in no sense does he conceive of this union with Christ as a human work.¹³⁵ Edwards does believe that the believer who has “the seals of the Holy Spirit” will inevitably keep God’s words, and will produce the fruits of saving faith as the evidence of God’s *forensic* declaration.¹³⁶ It is the role of the Holy Spirit to produce faith in Christ and to enable the wicked to receive Christ with all of his benefits. Since natural man has no power to “seek his salvation,” without the saving work of the Holy Spirit he remains “with no sensible alteration,” even after hearing the “sweet invitation of the gospel.”¹³⁷ It is the efficacious call of the Holy Spirit which eventually leads us to have interest in Christ:

As the suggesting words of Scripture to the mind, is only the exciting in the mind ideas of certain sound or letters; so it is only one way of exciting ideas in the imagination; for sounds and letters are external things, that are the objects of the external senses of seeing and hearing.... therefore, by what has been already said concerning these external ideas, it is evident that they are nothing spiritual, and if at any time the Spirit of God suggests these letters or sounds to the mind, this is a common, and not any special or gracious influence of that Spirit.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ Ibid., 342. Here Edwards also talks about “converting grace,” which changes the hearts of the wicked to repent, so that they can turn themselves against their own iniquity.

¹³⁵ Edwards, *Justification*, 96.

¹³⁶ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 232-33. In our previous discussion, we saw the fruit of saving faith as the proof of God’s saving grace.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 102-106, 138.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 219.

The Holy Spirit reveals the work of Christ to the wicked through the preaching of God's word or the gospel, and helps us to understand God's love. And the Holy Spirit effects faith in us, and in this way offers and gives Christ. In Edwards's theology, it is the role of the Holy Spirit, which not only offers the treasure of salvation through the word of God but also unites us with Christ through faith alone. Forensic union happens by the efficacious work of the Holy Spirit, which produces a love for God in the wicked. Thus, the Holy Spirit is the one who offers Christ and helps us to receive him through faith *alone*. In other words, the Holy Spirit brings about our *forensic* union with Christ and produces in us a love for God. The result is that the wicked are made partakers of the benefits of Christ's redemptive work and declared just by the divine Judge. It is significant that when Edwards writes that the wicked are *legally* justified in union with Christ, he does not mean that they receive Christ's righteousness, but that they become "identified" with Christ's righteousness because they are *in Christ*.¹³⁹

True Christians are as it were clothed with the meek, quiet, and loving temper of Christ; for as many as are *in Christ*, have put on Christ. And in this respect the church is clothed with the Sun, not only by *being clothed with his imputed righteousness*, but also by being adorned with his graces (Rom. 13:14).¹⁴⁰

As for the *forensic* aspect of justification, participation in Christ by the Holy Spirit is extended to sinners *sola fide—sola gratia* on the basis of Christ's righteousness *alone*. It is only because of this participation in Christ that the wicked are forgiven their sins and set free from their guilt. Edwards describes the doctrine of justification as he summarizes the freeness of God's grace: "The notion of the freeness of the grace of God

¹³⁹ Anthony Hoekema also describes the legal union with Christ as "we become identified with God's righteousness." Hoekema, *Saved*, 61.

¹⁴⁰ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 347 (italics added).

to sinners, as that is revealed and taught in the gospel, is not that no holy and amiable qualification or action in us shall be a fruit, and so a sign of that grace; but that is not the worthiness or loveliness of any qualifications or actions of ours which recommends us to that grace.... Thus we are justified only by the righteousness of Christ, and not by our righteousness."¹⁴¹ Therefore, Edwards's doctrine of *justification by faith alone* has not only the *forensic* notion of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but also the idea of God's free grace.¹⁴²

What are the merits and benefits of Christ to be imputed by God's free grace? In what sense does God legally declare the wicked just through imputation? As we have seen, Edwards strongly denies human autonomy in salvation, for human merits are unacceptable in the gift of salvation. Edwards's statement deserves our attention, because it clearly shows that he fully understands the view of the Reformers that the sole ground of our righteousness before God is the imputation of Christ's active and passive obedience:

The sufferings of Christ are respected in Scripture under a twofold consideration: either merely as His being substituted for us or put into our stead in suffering the penalty of the law (and so His sufferings are considered as a satisfaction and propitiation for sin), or as He, in obedience to the law or command of the Father, voluntarily submitted Himself to those sufferings and actively yielded Himself up to bear them. And so they are considered as His righteousness and a part of His active obedience.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 455.

¹⁴² Ibid., 455. Edwards calls "God's grace in the gospel" "gospel grace," maintaining the idea of *sola fide-sola gratia*. Ibid., 306, 357, 455, 458. For Edwards, the wicked are justified by God's grace. Edwards, *Justification*, 37-63; Jonathan Edwards, *Treatise on Grace: and Other Posthumously Published Writings* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1971), 8, 37-38. It is impossible for the will of the fallen to be saved by his own power. Edwards, *Treatise on Grace*, 38-39.

¹⁴³ Edwards, *Justification*, 77. For Edwards, the atonement is God's gracious work. Ibid., 74. Cf. Edwards, *History*, 309-12; Rudisill, 29-30. In New England, some followers of Edwards failed to understand the necessity of Christ's satisfaction. Samuel Hopkins and Timothy Dwight denied the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. The New Divinity men and the New Haven

There is no question that Edwards speaks of the perfect active obedience of Christ in his life as that which determines our righteousness. This is consistent with his overall approach to theology.¹⁴⁴ On the basis on Christ's righteousness, the wicked are accepted as righteous by the divine Judge. In this sense, Christ's righteousness is God's gift, because he accepts his righteousness for us. However, Edwards emphasizes the *voluntary* obedience of Christ by which we are *legally* justified. Edwards's discussion also makes an important point that the benefits of Christ's perfect obedience include the work of Christ's propitiation, in which Christ *satisfies* the demands of the law by offering himself as a sacrifice for our sins. For Edwards, Christ's righteousness alone is the ground of justification. Thus, in the gift of salvation, Christ's righteousness is appropriated by us through *forensic* imputation. Edwards responds to the Arminians by saying that justification is a *forensic* declaration of God in which he declares legally us just, based on the righteousness of God. The justification of every believer includes the double transfer:

But that a believer's justification implies not only remission of sins, or acquittal from the wrath due to it, but also an admittance to a title to that glory which is the reward of righteousness, is more directly taught in the Scripture, particularly in Romans 5:1-2, where the apostle mentions both of these as joint benefits implied in justification.¹⁴⁵

Theologians ignored the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Gerstner, *Rational*, 2:425; Rudisill, 126-29. However Edwards follows the Reformers in the doctrine of the atonement.

¹⁴⁴ Both the *negative* and the *positive* righteousness of Christ become the believer's through Christ's atonement and perfect obedience by imputation. Edwards, *Justification*, 5, 63, 69-70; Jonathan Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 15, *Notes on Scripture*, ed. Stephen J. Stein (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 129.

¹⁴⁵ Edwards, *Justification*, 7. Cf. *Ibid.*, 108.

Romans 5:1-2 does support Edwards's view of the double transfer in *forensic* justification. This double transfer occurs in our relation to Christ: the imputation of our sins to Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness to us. The perfect righteousness of Christ is *legally* credited to the believer's account as though the believer had never sinned. Edwards portrays salvation as the *covering* of our sins by the robe of Christ's righteousness.¹⁴⁶ This is the point of justification for Edwards. God declares *legally* the wicked righteous not because they are actually righteous, but because Christ is actually righteous and they are *covered* with his righteousness. Therefore, Edwards says that the ground of justification is the *immediate* imputation of Christ's righteousness to us. Through faith alone, God clothes the believer with Christ's righteousness, so that the perfect obedience and righteousness of Christ can be *legally credited, transferred, or imputed* to his account through his legal declaration. Once the *legal* union is established by God's gracious work, based on Christ's righteousness, he covers God's children with Christ's righteousness.

With his notion of imputation, Edwards rules out works-righteousness from the doctrine of justification. Like the Reformers, Edwards's view of justification is *synthetic*. The Roman Catholic understanding of justification is *analytical* rather than synthetic. In that *analytical* view, God declares the wicked righteous when righteousness *inheres* in them. For Luther, justifying righteousness is the *alien righteousness* of Christ, "external to man and imputed to him."¹⁴⁷ Edwards maintains in the doctrine of imputation that God

¹⁴⁶ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 328; Edwards, *Justification*, 109.

¹⁴⁷ Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 15-16; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, from 1500 to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 2-3, 33.

declares the wicked righteous based on the righteousness that is *added* from outside of them, that is, the *imputed* righteousness of Christ. This *alien* righteousness is unable to be found in the wicked. Justification is God's *declarative judgment* on the basis of Christ's work, not on the basis of a *divine analysis* of "the renewed man."¹⁴⁸

[There is] nothing derogatory to *the freedom and sovereignty of gospel grace*, nothing in the least clashing with *the gospel doctrine of justification by faith alone* without the works of the law, nothing in the least tending to lessen the glory of the mediator, and or dependence on *his righteousness*, nothing infringing on the special prerogatives of faith in the affair of our salvation, nothing in any wise detracting from *the glory of God and his mercy*, or exalting man, or diminishing his dependence and obligation.¹⁴⁹

In this statement, the issue of the doctrine of *justification by faith alone* again leads us into the sovereignty of God's grace. Doubtlessly, the righteousness of Christ is received *sola fide—sola gratia*, but justification does not come from any "goodness" or "anything" in us.¹⁵⁰ Morimoto argues that in Edwards's view, "inherent goodness becomes 'acceptable' and 'rewardable' only after justification."¹⁵¹ Morimoto does not properly understand the imputed righteousness of Christ as he speaks of Edwards's doctrine of justification. It is clear that Morimoto confuses "inherent goodness" with *alien* righteousness. What Morimoto basically misunderstands is that the *alien* righteousness of Christ never becomes *inherent* in us even after justification. Moreover, Edwards does not use the phrase "inherent goodness" for the justification of the wicked

¹⁴⁸ Edwards, *Justification*, 142. Edwards's point here is that Abraham is also justified by faith alone through God's *declarative* judgment. It clearly shows that Edwards has a *synthetic* view of justification. Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 15-16.

¹⁴⁹ Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 458-59 (italics added).

¹⁵⁰ Edwards, *Justification*, 28-29, 60-61, 83-85; Edwards, *Freedom*, 340-41.

¹⁵¹ Morimoto, 94.

in his works. Edwards uses the term *inherent* for the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, but he does not use it for the imputed righteousness of Christ. Edwards certainly agrees that the wicked are justified by the imputation of an *alien* righteousness.¹⁵² This *alien* righteousness is the righteousness of Christ. And this alien righteousness of Christ is *extra nos* (*outside of us*) in Edwards's doctrine of justification. Granting the idea of Luther's alien righteousness, Edwards believes that the righteousness that justifies the wicked is not *inherent* righteousness but *alien* righteousness. No human righteousness or goodness is accepted by God in justification. Because of our "inherent deformity," our *best* works are not acceptable to God. Our good works become "acceptable" only after the *legal* declaration of God that we are justified.¹⁵³ On the basis of God's acceptance, believers are "rewarded for their works" *for Christ's sake only*.

It is acknowledged that God, in rewarding the holiness and good works of believers, does in some respect give them happiness as a testimony of His respect for the loveliness of their holiness and goods works in His sight; for that is the very notion of a reward.¹⁵⁴

For Edwards, the salvation of the believer is founded in Christ's righteousness through its *legal* imputation *sola gratia*. Through the legal union with Christ, believers are "as members of Christ," so that God considers their good works as "Christ's."¹⁵⁵ It is "God's acceptance of the amiableness" of their obedience in Christ.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² Edwards, *Justification*, 82-83. Charles Hodge rightly sees Edwards as a faithful follower of the Reformers in the doctrine of imputation of Christ's righteousness. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989), 3:148.

Edwards argues that the Arminian doctrine of imputation is inconsistent because of their notion of human ability in regeneration. No one deserves the reward of salvation in Edwards's theology. Edwards, *Justification*, 83, 105.

¹⁵³ Edwards, *Justification*, 104-105; Edwards, *Freedom*, 340-41.

¹⁵⁴ Edwards, *Justification*, 107.

Is Edwards's doctrine of sanctification consistent with the doctrine of justification? Edwards certainly thinks that the believer who is justified *sola fide* brings forth obedience not only inevitably but also immediately, for sanctification is the "evidence" of justification.¹⁵⁷ Edwards would support Luther's phrase *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously just and a sinner). With regard to the imputed righteousness of Christ to the believer, he is considered righteous, but with regard to his fleshly nature, he is still a sinner.¹⁵⁸ For Edwards, justification has nothing to do with our goodness, because our justification is attributed to Christ's redemptive work. Justification is a matter of imputation, and not of infusion. In John Smith's view, Edwards makes great progress in understanding Christian practice after justification:

In setting up practice as a cardinal test, Edwards was no mere follower of tradition. Classical Protestantism had placed considerable emphasis upon the inner workings of the Spirit and upon the primacy of faith. Puritanism went even further in the direction of making religion into an affair of the interior life. While Edwards's doctrine of affections carried this trend forward, it also took a large step in the direction of making action a center of attention. American Protestantism has never been far from believing that the most reliable test of religious sincerity is the deed; seeing what a man will do is the best test of his heart.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 109-11. Believers are understood here as the "mystical body of Christ"; that is, they are regarded as partakers of Christ's benefits because of the obedience and merit of Christ. Ibid., 117-18, 113-14; Edwards, *Treatise on Grace*, 28, 34

¹⁵⁶ Edwards, *Justification*, 112.

¹⁵⁷ In our previous discussion, we saw that in *Religious Affections* Edwards seeks to prove this point. Cf. Edwards, *Religious Affections*, 231-39.

¹⁵⁸ In Edwards's view of perseverance, God preserves believers throughout their lives, but they may fall into temptation: "True saints may be guilty of some kinds and degrees of backsliding, and may be soiled by particular temptations, and may fall into sin, yea great sins: but they can never fall away so, as to grow weary of religion, and the service of God, and habitually to dislike it and neglect it; either on its own account, or on account of the difficulties that attend it: as is evident by Gal. 6:9; Rom. 2:7; Heb. 10:36; Is. 43:22; Mal. 1:13." Ibid., 390.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 42. This is quoted from Editor's (John Smith's) Introduction in Edwards's *Religious Affections*.

According to Smith, Edwards's doctrine of sanctification is important, as Edwards develops it more than not only the doctrine of justification of classical Protestantism, but also the pietism of Puritanism. John Smith also rightly credits Edwards with a fuller view of sanctification and with a *synthetic* view of justification "without becoming involved in a doctrine of works" in his *Religious Affections*.¹⁶⁰ There is "no justification" in human works.¹⁶¹

In summary, like the Reformers, Edwards's doctrine of *forensic* imputation holds that after the Fall, without the basis of a legal union with Christ a person cannot become righteous, since his obedience is imperfect in the eyes of God. In Edwards's theology, the notion of Adam's federal headship links original sin to the need for the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness. Throughout this discussion of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness, Edwards is explicitly reflecting on the monergistic view of the Reformers that *by faith alone* Christ's righteousness becomes *immediately* ours. It is the gracious work of God. It is important to note that in Edwards's theology, no one is considered to be righteous before God without the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness. The imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked is of crucial importance in his doctrine of justification. The doctrine of atonement turns out to be useless for the sinner, unless there is the *forensic* imputation. If there is no imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, then the church falls.

Edwards's understanding of *forensic* justification shows the primacy of *sola fide*—*sola gratia* in the Reformers. Edwards's primary motif in discussing the *forensic*

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 42.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 42-3.

imputation of Christ's righteousness is on *sola gratia* in justification. Edwards makes it clear that through the *forensic union* with Christ, Christ's righteousness is *legally transferred or reckoned* to the account of the believers. And this is solely God's work of grace, received by faith alone. It is worth noting again that for Edwards, his doctrine of *the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked* is not substantially different from the position of the Reformers.

B. Timothy Dwight (1752-1817)

In this section, we will explore Dwight's thought on imputation in justification, for it shows a typical pattern of moderate Calvinism. Timothy Dwight is assumed to be an important figure in the revivalism of the Second Great Awakening. He devoted a great deal of attention to the question of revivalistic Calvinism in New England. New Haven Theology came to light under the leadership of Timothy Dwight in departing from Jonathan Edwards.¹⁶²

In the late eighteenth century, the Old Calvinists (the Moderates) were disrupted by the New Divinity men, for the Old Calvinists opposed the emotional subjectivity of revivals and followed the view of New England Puritanism that God usually responds to hearts prepared to obtain salvation.¹⁶³ The New Divinity men fought against the rise of moralism and democracy with revivalism in the spirit of the Great Awakening.¹⁶⁴

Dwight's concept of salvation differs from that of New Divinity Theology and New England Puritanism. If there is going to be any salvation, it has to be obtained by the unregenerate. Thus, Dwight encouraged people to find God's favor. With his revivalistic

¹⁶² Objectively, the New Divinity (also known as the Edwardseans) had no objection to the spirit of the old Puritan teachings such as regenerate membership. Whatever the surface similarities in theology, the New Divinity contained within it some seeds of the teachings of Jonathan Edwards, but it eventually departed from him in the doctrine of justification. However, the Old Calvinists (also known as the Moderates), the opponents of the New Divinity, fought back with their faith in a God who directed rational requirements for religion as bringing on the traditional New England Puritanism. Guelzo, 112-75; Stephen E. Berk, *Calvinism versus Democracy: Timothy Dwight and the Origins of American Evangelical Orthodoxy* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books 1974), 10-12.

¹⁶³ Berk, 11; Guelzo, 143-46. In the eighteenth century, evangelical pietism and rationalist moralism prevailed in New England. Dwight considered himself a Calvinist. Revival swept over Yale from 1801 to 1831. In the eighteenth century, there was a religious decline due to the rise of moralism and democracy in America. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 3-46; Berk, 3-17, 71-73.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 403-14.

motive, Dwight developed New Haven Theology during the revivals of the Second Great Awakening.

1. The Justification of the Wicked

A comparison of the theological systems of Timothy Dwight and the New Divinity with respect to the doctrine of salvation would require careful attention to the doctrine of justification. It will be useful to see how he thinks about the doctrine of man. Is *sola fide* essential to the doctrine of justification in Timothy Dwight? What is the relation between the human will and faith in his theology? Does human freedom precede God's grace? What is the nature of faith in his doctrine of justification?

Dwight strongly emphasizes the power of the human will in justification. Dwight's understands *faith* as a *voluntary* act of the mind, which results in a conditional salvation.¹⁶⁵ In short, Dwight often holds positions that John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards never held. The New Divinity men, like Samuel Hopkins and Joseph Bellamy, emphasized the role of faith in justification.¹⁶⁶ They came to the conclusion that faith is a condition for justification. The exercise of human freedom leads to the obtaining of salvation, in their view. Dwight proceeds along similar ideas, but sees faith as a system of duty, a form of works-righteousness.

¹⁶⁵ Dwight, "Justification—The Duty of Believing," *Theology Explained and Defended*, vol. 2 (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1863), 312-23.

¹⁶⁶ Joseph Bellamy, *True Religion Delineated, or Experimental Religion as Distinguished from Formality and Enthusiasm* (Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1850), 357-58; Guelzo, 130-33. The New Divinity men adopt a new view of faith in justification, in which the wicked are justified through their own faith, insisting that the Old Calvinists and the Arminians taught the doctrine of justification by works.

Most significant for the present study would be an understanding of Dwight's view of the gospel. Dwight clearly says, "The Gospel takes man, where it finds him, in a state of sin and ruin, condemned by the law of God to final perdition, and incapable of justification, by his own righteousness."¹⁶⁷ Interestingly, Dwight acknowledges the inability of the wicked to obtain justification when he says that we are incapable of obtaining justification by our own righteousness.¹⁶⁸ Accordingly, he realizes that we are not justified by our own righteousness, but by Christ's righteousness. After giving his explanation of the gospel, Dwight states, "The Religion of the Gospel is a religion designed for sinners. By the expiation of Christ it opens the brazen door, which was for ever barred against their return."¹⁶⁹ He comes to the following conclusion: "Man, therefore, in the Gospel finds his return from apostasy made possible; made easy; made certain; actually begun; steadily carried on in the present world; and finally completed in the world to come."¹⁷⁰ However, these statements cannot be simply accepted as similar to the theology of Jonathan Edwards. Dwight's statements need to be examined closely.

When Dwight insists that we are justified by God's grace, he actually allows human merit to contribute to justification.¹⁷¹ The Reformers and Edwards saw that God's

¹⁶⁷ Dwight perceives that we are not declared righteous by our own righteousness, but by Christ's righteousness. Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Objections Answered, Application," *Theology*, 2:227.

¹⁶⁸ Dwight insists on the "absolute impossibility of justification by works of law." Dwight, "Apostate Man Cannot Be Justified by Works of Law," *Theology*, 1:509.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 2:228.

¹⁷⁰ Dwight, 2:228.

¹⁷¹ Dwight, 2:338.

grace operates apart from any human merit.¹⁷² In his discussion of the law, Dwight ends up describing the gospel as a New Law: “The Gospel is a Law; and of equal authority and obligation with the moral Law.”¹⁷³ The idea that the gospel is the “highest duty” pervades Dwight’s doctrine of justification.¹⁷⁴ Dwight states:

What, then, is the nature of this duty? In the most summary language, it is this: That we renounce our sin, and return to God, and to obedience; committing ourselves with an affectionate confidence to Christ, as our Instructor, Intercessor, and Lord, and as an all-sufficient and acceptable Propitiation to God the Father. This done, our sins will be forgiven; and our title to endless life renewed, enlarged, and made sure beyond defeat and danger.¹⁷⁵

This statement reveals how Dwight understands the nature of this duty in justification. Since Dwight’s system of duty is closely related to his doctrine of atonement, his view of atonement must be briefly discussed, before we proceed further. For him, the recovery of God’s moral government through Christ’s sacrifice comes before the atonement for the sins of mankind. It is primarily a governmental purpose demonstrating God’s righteousness. It is based on a sacrifice of Christ that first manifests God’s righteousness and that second justifies sinners.¹⁷⁶ Here Dwight indicates that a

¹⁷² Sproul, *Faith*, 151.

¹⁷³ Dwight, “Universality of Sin,” 1:448-51. Dwight also calls “the word of God” a law. *Ibid.*, 1:447.

¹⁷⁴ The idea of *duty* appears in 72 out of Dwight’s 173 sermons. Hugh Frank Foster, *A Genetic History of the New England* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1987), 364-65.

¹⁷⁵ Dwight, “Universality of Sin,” 1:451-52.

¹⁷⁶ Dwight follows the line of the New Divinity in the doctrine of atonement. Dwight, “Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement,” *Theology*, 2:205-11; Dwight, “Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence,” *Theology*, 2:194-96; Dwight, “Universality of Sin Proved by Man’s Rejection of the Word of God,” *Theology*, 1:459.

What should be noted here is that Dwight offers the terms of the Reformed theology such as a vicarious atonement, satisfaction to justice, propitiation, redemption, ransom, and the passive and active obedience of Christ. However, Dwight remains in the line of the New Divinity rather than Edwards in the nature of atonement, for it is fundamentally based on governmental purpose.

sinner is a *lawbreaker*, but it is different from Edwards's concept of sinner in the doctrine of justification.¹⁷⁷ What is important to see here is that Dwight's view of justification consists of moral government, by which the sinner is punished or justified:

Moral government is a government by laws; whose nature, and sanctions, are the great inducements to obedience, and the great means of order, peace, and happiness, to subjects; *and of honour and reverence to the Ruler*. In other words, it is a government by motives, addressed to the understanding and affections of rational subjects, and operating on their minds, as inducements to voluntary obedience.¹⁷⁸

Dwight's scheme of atonement has to do with the efficacy of God's moral government, not the efficacious grace of God in justification. Dwight affirms that Christ's atonement is to magnify God and his law.¹⁷⁹ It is quite unfortunate that the necessity of atonement in the New Divinity is restated in Dwight's theology in terms of the moral government of God. For the New Divinity, the purpose of the atoning work of Christ is to justify God, not men. The primary purpose of the atonement is to justify God as the moral Governor who has "moral obligation to punish sin," his moral law, and his moral

Justification appears to be secondary to the atonement of Christ to Dwight. God's grace in Dwight involves his justice. Through God's justice, his mercy is shown to Dwight. Dwight clearly remains in the line of the New Divinity, for God's moral government depends on the law, and Christ came to justify the righteousness of God. Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement," *Theology*, 2:206-7.

¹⁷⁷ Dwight, "The Truth of God," *Theology*, 1:209; Dwight, "Creation—Man," *Theology*, 1:346; Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence, the Manner in Which It Is Performed, Its Extent," *Theology*, 2:196-98; Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement," *Theology*, 2:215-17. Adam dishonored the law of God and God's government through his disobedience. Dwight, "Apostate Man Cannot Be Justified by Works of Law," *Theology*, 1:508-9.

¹⁷⁸ Dwight, "The Truth of God," *Theology*, 1:209 (italics not added). In this governmental system, God is the only judge. Thus, the sinner rebels against the law of the divine Judge. Above all things, Christ came to meet the need for the justice of God's moral government. Dwight, "Attribute of God—The Justice of God," *Theology*, 1:193-95. Cf. Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence," *Theology*, 1:202-3; Dwight, *Theology*, 2:195.

¹⁷⁹ Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ—His Atonement," *Theology*, 2:215; Dwight, "Providence—The Probation of Man," *Theology*, 1:401; Dwight, "The Truth of God," *Theology*, 1:209.

government.¹⁸⁰ In Edwards's theology, the necessity of atonement basically comes from the effects of original sin, not from God's moral government. Dwight, however, defines sin as "a crime committed against" God's government.¹⁸¹ Unfortunately, he, with the governmental view of the atonement, detaches himself not only from the doctrine of the necessity of the atonement, but also from the doctrine of justification by faith alone through Christ alone.

By God's grace, through the vicarious work of Christ, everyone is given an equal opportunity to fulfill this highest duty to obey the new law, that is, the gospel.¹⁸² "God requires nothing" from the wicked except voluntary obedience to this duty, so that they can be accepted by God.¹⁸³ What does Dwight mean by voluntary action? The notion that the gospel is the highest duty means that there is an *absolutely necessary* condition for the justification of the wicked, such as faith, since the atonement of Christ is sufficient "to open the door" for the forgiveness of all the wicked.¹⁸⁴ Can a person be saved if he has faith in Christ and in his own meritorious works? Dwight says that faith is a "virtue":

¹⁸⁰ Rudisill, 36-71. Guelzo summarizes the doctrine of atonement in the New Divinity: "So Christ did not actually die in the place of any individuals. His atonement was intended to justify God, not humans, and when God forgave anyone, it was not because Christ had merited it for them personally." Guelzo, 133.

¹⁸¹ Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence, The Manner in Which It Is Performed: Its Extent" *Theology*, 2:195. Cf. Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Objections Answered, Application," *Theology*, 2:223; Dwight, "Decrees of God," *Theology*, 1:253.

¹⁸² Dwight firmly believes that Christ's atonement opens the door for all mankind. By rejecting the doctrine of limited atonement, Dwight makes a place for moral ability in attaining salvation. His doctrine of the general atonement helps him make justification available through the act of faith. Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement," *Theology*, 2:217-18; Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence," *Theology*, 2:196-98; Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Objections Answered, Application," *Theology*, 2:223; Berk, 87-89.

¹⁸³ Dwight, "Universality of Sin," 1:452.

¹⁸⁴ Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ," 2:216; 1:452. Dwight thinks that by God's grace the justification of the wicked is made possible through the obedience of Christ, not by our own obedience. Dwight rightly maintains that by God's grace "Christ satisfied the demands of the law by his active and

It is honourable to God, that he should annex justification to virtue, and not to any thing of a different nature.

Faith is a *virtue*. But the works of mankind, wrought before the existence of faith in the soul, are in no sense virtuous. Faith, also, is the *commencement of virtue in man*. It is highly honourable to God, that he should annex justification to the first appearance of virtue in the human character. In this manner, he exhibits, in the strongest degree, his readiness to forgive, accept, and save, the returning sinner.¹⁸⁵

With the idea of faith as the “true source of virtuous obedience,” Dwight holds to a radically different concept than had been described in the traditions of the Reformers and of the New England theologians like Edwards.¹⁸⁶ Edwards’s chief concern is for the idea of *sola gratia* in the doctrine of justification, not just in the doctrine of atonement. But Dwight’s doctrine of faith refers to God’s conditional love in salvation, or to conditional salvation based on human works, for God expects us to obey the law of the gospel in his moral government since he gives us the ability to accept God’s love in salvation with the power of our will. In this sense, Dwight speaks of faith in terms of meritorious works. When the Reformers and Edwards speak of “faith alone,” they mean that faith is not faith in our faith but in Christ, because justification is by the imputed merit of Christ alone.

One might say that Dwight does not deny that we are justified by the free grace of God:

It must be acknowledged, that without exception they [the children of believing parents] are the subjects of justification; and that they are in no sense justified on account of their own righteousness; but solely by the free grace of God, on account of

passive obedience.” However, his understanding of God’s grace does not cover the area of justification, but only the obstacles of salvation, that is, the demands of the law, which cannot be removed by human obedience or human righteous acts. Dwight, 2:300-306.

¹⁸⁵ Dwight, “The Influence of Faith,” 2:344 (italics not added). For Dwight, regeneration is also the “commencement of virtue in the soul.” Dwight, 2:305.

¹⁸⁶ Dwight, “The Influence of Faith in Our Justification,” 2:344.

the righteousness of Christ.... The Scriptures nowhere teach us, that we are justified partly on account of our own righteousness, and partly on account of the righteousness of Christ.¹⁸⁷

Dwight sees the righteousness of Christ as a necessary condition for our justification. The question remains: How is Christ's righteousness available to the wicked? For Dwight, spiritual blessings, including the righteousness of Christ, are the result of God's grace.¹⁸⁸ God's grace creates in human beings an opportunity for salvation, which takes the form of *moral duty* in Dwight's theology.

The difference between Edwards and Dwight is not whether there is God's grace in salvation or not. The real difference lies in whether they think this grace of God creates in the wicked an ability to choose their eternal salvation through their own decision. The point of argument is whether faith is a *virtue* as a product of God's grace through the atonement of Christ.¹⁸⁹ Dwight describes the virtuous aspect of faith: "The mind is perfectly voluntary in the employment of collecting evidence, on every question which it discusses.... In this case, the mind can either resolve, or refuse, to collect arguments; and in this conduct is wholly voluntary, and capable, therefore, of being either virtuous or sinful, praiseworthy or blameworthy, rewardable or punishable."¹⁹⁰ In Dwight's system, God's grace does not dominate the soul in justification. In his understanding of the gospel as the most important duty, the essence of faith consists in having voluntary confidence in Christ as our Lord. In order for the voluntary confidence to be counted as our own, we

¹⁸⁷ Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," 2:308.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 2:307.

¹⁸⁹ In this sense, Christ "made a complete atonement" for our sins in Dwight's thought. Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," 2:306.

¹⁹⁰ Dwight, "Justification—The Duty of Believing," 2:316.

have to exercise our will, in which the action arises in salvation.¹⁹¹ Dwight's denial of God's saving grace eventually deviates from Edwards's concept of man's moral inability.

Clearly, Dwight intends to emphasize that faith is a necessary *duty* as a response to the declaration of the gospel. The emphasis of the Reformers on God's saving grace in the doctrine of justification is removed here by the theologians of New England. For Dwight, faith turns out to be human *moral* responsibility. God's grace in Dwight's theology is not the strongest motive in salvation, as in Edwards's theology. Does God's grace require human cooperation in salvation? Dwight states: "Let, then, this glorious Being [God] be believed without distrust: without delay. Let every sinner boldly come to the throne of grace; to the door of life; and be assured, that, if he desires sincerely to enter, he will not be shut out."¹⁹² It is precisely what Dwight calls God's grace that works by human consent to the gospel.¹⁹³ Thus, God's grace becomes human ability to earn his favor in salvation.

Dwight's objection to the position of Edwards is also grounded on this consideration: Dwight insists that grace is necessary for righteousness. However, he sees God's grace in the doctrine of man as a principle that provides human beings with an absolute power to decide even in salvation. In this way, the self-determining power of the

¹⁹¹ For Dwight, faith, confidence, and trust are synonymous terms. Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 2:326; 1:276.

¹⁹² Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," 2:311.

¹⁹³ Dwight also states that "In this offer he [Christ] declares himself able, willing, and faithful, to *save to the uttermost all that will come unto God by him*." Dwight, "Faith and Necessary to Restore Us to Obedience," 4:33 (italics not added). He strongly insists that Christ does not save us "unless we confide in this [offer]." Ibid.

New Divinity is retrieved in a distinctive way.¹⁹⁴ For Dwight, the grace in justification is resistible. Thus, it creates in human beings the moral ability to obtain salvation. Dwight hesitates to call this a semi-Pelagian notion, yet Dwight does not reject the New Divinity idea that salvation can occur by the exercise of free will.

Dwight's comments concerning the system of duty can be best understood in light of *voluntary cooperation*. With voluntary cooperation men ought to fulfill God's purpose in them to do good and to glorify him: "There is in such beings no other virtue, beside this voluntary co-operation. But the virtue of Intelligent creatures is, beyond all comparison, far the most important part of the whole end of Creation and Providence."¹⁹⁵ Dwight here comments on the purpose of God's creation. Voluntary cooperation is what constitutes the kernel of Dwight's concept of salvation. At the same time, he recognizes that the ability of voluntary cooperation in the mind is sustained and preserved as obligation by God. Dwight's soteriology does not lose sight of this voluntary cooperation, for regeneration is constituted in this realm beyond God's grace.¹⁹⁶ That is, free will must be active in regeneration. This disposition of voluntary cooperation toward salvation in Dwight's theology results in such participation of humanity in justification.¹⁹⁷ Dwight's concept of voluntary cooperation, needless to say, is a synergistic notion of justification.

¹⁹⁴ Although the major concern of the New Divinity was with an Edwardsean revivalism in the New England to defend American Calvinism, unfortunately they modified Calvinistic views of original sin, atonement and imputation. Actually, they found human ability in salvation with their inconsistent doctrine of human depravity to prove unlimited divine grace. Guelzo, 103, 112-139.

¹⁹⁵ Dwight, "The Chief End of Man," 1:386-88. There are "three great powers of understanding, will, and motivity" in Dwight's thought. Men ought to achieve God's purpose in creation with these three elements. Ibid., 1:384, 386.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 1:390-91.

The Reformers and Edwards use the concept of the will in the sense of total depravity, but their notion is neither prominent nor influential in Dwight's thought. With the idea of voluntary cooperation, Dwight's emphasis on man's moral ability to do good is completely different from that of Edwards. How does Dwight express his concept of voluntary cooperation? It is appropriate to review Dwight's thoughts on the doctrine of original sin here. Such an examination will shed light on Dwight's view of justification, as well as on his different view of the human will.

What draws our attention, first of all, in Dwight's doctrine of man is what the leader of New Haven Theology thinks about the pollution of the mind and the will after the Fall.¹⁹⁸ Dwight, however, does not explain further in what way we are "in Adam" or how this depravity is inherited, he fails to give a proper explanation of our relation to Christ's righteousness in justification. In fact, Dwight makes it clear that he actually does not know the cause of moral actions.¹⁹⁹ However, there is a "certain connection" between the first sin of Adam and the depravity of his posterity.²⁰⁰ Dwight defines human depravity as "perpetual and habitual sin, or that depraved state of soul."²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 1:391-92. Dwight shows here the necessity of regeneration in relation to the notion of voluntary cooperation. This disposition of voluntary cooperation can be considered a part of moral ability to do good.

¹⁹⁸ In Dwight's judgment, men are *morally* corrupted. He also would say that they are spiritually dead. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:488; 1:427. We will examine further Dwight's doctrine of the imputation of original sin in the next section, "the imputation of Christ's righteousness."

¹⁹⁹ Dwight, "The Temptation and Fall," *Theology*, 1:410-11.

²⁰⁰ We will discuss it later in the next section.

²⁰¹ Dwight, "The Sentence Pronounced on Man," *Theology*, 1:427 (italics not added). Dwight states: "It is, also, the source of the hatred, malevolence, envy, revenge, deceit, violence, and injustice, which so universally and dreadfully, distress, and destroy, Intelligent creatures, in the present world; and in every world, where these dispositions prevail." Ibid.

For Dwight, human beings certainly inherit this habitual sin or human depravity.

Here his methodology makes no distinction between habitual sin and sinful nature.

Dwight simply traces a root of habitual sin from sinful actions. It, however, must not be confused with his view that the human will after the Fall tends to have absolute freedom in salvation. He claims that human freedom is exercised in regeneration once the highest duty in salvation is rightly fulfilled.²⁰² While Calvin and Edwards argue that human beings are totally corrupted, Dwight does not clearly see that the understanding and the will are totally corrupted. Clearly, Dwight does not take human depravity seriously in the doctrine of man.

In Dwight's doctrine of man, the will is described as the *energy* of the mind.

Dwight states that the mind is controlled by depravity. In this construction, he argues that the human will is corrupted.²⁰³ Does he believe the notion of total depravity of the Reformers? It is clear that Dwight does affirm *some* sort of human depravity. What he affirms, however, differs from Edwards's view of human inability, and Dwight's doctrine of human depravity eventually supports human ability in justification. One should ask what reasonable explanation can be drawn from his idea. On the question of the relation between the mind and the will, one cannot therefore expect Dwight to give a clear

²⁰² These claims of hereditary depravity come from the idea that man is a moral agent who possesses understanding and a will. Dwight, "Providence—The Probation of Man," *Theology*, 1:393.

²⁰³ For Dwight, the mind has three faculties: thought, volition, and motivity. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:357; Dwight, "Human Depravity Derived from Adam," *Theology*, 1:488; Dwight, "The Sentence Pronounced on Man," *Theology*, 1:427; Dwight, "Providence—The Temptation and Fall," *Theology*, 1:411; Dwight, *Theology*, 1:244; 1:488.

picture.²⁰⁴ In Dwight's thought, human depravity does not demolish human freedom in order for him to maintain *synergism* in the doctrine of justification.

In what way does Dwight maintain synergism in justification? On what basis does a man make a decision in Dwight's theology? He maintains that there are three *active* powers in man, which are essential proofs of human freedom: understanding, will, and motivity.²⁰⁵ A person is given motives in two ways, which can *influence* him or her in God's moral government, that is, motives to obedience or disobedience:

*No government of the Universe can become the character of the Creator, except a moral government. ...The Law of God is, and must of necessity be, a rule of action for an immense multitude of beings, that is, for the whole intelligent Universe, throughout eternity.... The Motives to obedience must be great, uniform, always present, and always operative... A great part of all the motives to obedience, in such a Government, is presented by the uniformity, and exactness, of the administration.*²⁰⁶

Significantly, the moral government of God reflects Dwight's *synergism* on justification. It is run by motives and rules.²⁰⁷ In this respect, Dwight appears to be a New Divinity man. Here he brings in his vital notion of motives to further apply it to his soteriology. One may wonder, however, to what extent this idea of motives is sustained

²⁰⁴ Dwight, *Theology*, 1:395.

²⁰⁵ See Dwight, *Theology*, 1:375-77.

²⁰⁶ Dwight, "Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence," *Theology*, 2:202-203 (italics not added). Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:411-12.

²⁰⁷ For Dwight, human obedience is *virtuous* in God's moral government. Dwight, "Attributes of God: The Justice of God," *Theology*, 1:199-201; Dwight, "The Truth of God," *Theology*, 1:209-14. Dwight thinks that a person must trust *God's moral character*. Dwight comes to conclusion that the moral character is the resource of volitions. The next step, Dwight does not see the important relation between *sola fide* and *sola scriptura*, unlike Edwards. Dwight, "Universality of Sin," 1:435-37; Dwight, "The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:336; Richard Rabinowitz, *The Spiritual Self in Everyday Life: The Transformation of Personal Religious Experience in Nineteenth-Century New England* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989), 88.

by Dwight's doctrine of justification.²⁰⁸ Edwards certainly believes that human beings with these two faculties (the mind and the will) of the soul are inclined to sin. Without God's grace as the strongest motive, human beings are unable to earn God's favor in salvation. With the strongest motive in salvation, the decisive concept that Edwards wants to defend is human inability to do good and thus that justification is by grace alone.

Unlike Edwards, Dwight follows in the steps of the New Divinity, for in his view there is only a *partial* corruption of men after the Fall.²⁰⁹ With his notion of *partial* corruption, Dwight gives emphasis to motives in saying that God's free grace is already given to all, thus leaving salvation to human decision.²¹⁰ Motives in Dwight's thought, however, do not include God's grace in justification, for there is no concept of the strongest motive like Edwards. We do not understand Dwight's concept of faith correctly if we disregard the notion of motives in his theology. It will help us to see why he is eager to persuade people with this notion of motives.²¹¹ On this matter, Dwight remains firm that faith is necessary for acceptance by God:

²⁰⁸ It is important to recall, as we discussed before, that for Edwards after the Fall the understanding and the will are corrupted and unable to do good. Edwards believes that the strongest motive is perceived by the mind, and that the will follows the mind. And acts are performed on the will.

²⁰⁹ The New Divinity claims that the mind is not totally corrupted. In contrast to Edwards, only the will is corrupted after the Fall. There is a "partial corruption" of the will. Justification becomes a semi-Pelagian idea. It supports the idea of human ability to choose freely in regeneration. Cf. Guelzo, 91-97.

²¹⁰ It must be noted that there are several motives in his theology, such as the law of God (Dwight, *Theology*, 2:202), the atonement of Christ (Dwight, *Theology*, 2:196), the governmental administration of God (Dwight, *Theology*, 2:203), the government of God (Dwight, *Theology*, 2:196), the mediation of Christ and revelation (Dwight, *Theology*, 1:224), the word of God (Dwight, *Theology*, 1:450), and the gospel (Dwight, *Theology*, 1:451).

²¹¹ Dwight, *Theology*, 1:50-53. The understanding picks up motives. The mind acts to pass attractive motives from the heart to the will. Then, men act on the choice of motives by the will. See Dwight, *Theology*, 1:216-17.

Faith, in its first, and simple sense, is assent to probable evidence.... *The faith of the Gospel is the assent of the heart*, as well as *of the understanding*, to the declarations, contained in the Scriptures; the belief of a man, who regards them with good-will, and who is pleased with such truths as they present to the mind. The foundation of faith in these declarations is a similar faith in the character, especially the moral character of God, exhibited in them, and evidenced both by them, and other extraneous proof.... As, then, there is no medium between this character and confidence, or faith; it is, I think, past all doubt, that faith is indispensably necessary to acceptance with God.²¹²

This act of God's acceptance is nothing but the result of the fact that men are accepted on the basis of the act of faith. The same view appears in Dwight's sermons. In a sermon on the duty of belief, he describes the voluntary act of faith: "*That although faith is thus necessary, our conformity, or non-conformity, to what we believe, is still voluntary; and therefore virtuous.*"²¹³ It is clear, then, that for Dwight regeneration depends upon the voluntary act of faith, not upon God's sovereign grace. Under God's sovereign act of redemptive work in Christ, human beings are supposed to be active participants in regeneration. This view denies Edwards's idea of God's sovereign and efficacious grace, which can actually change the heart of the wicked to obtain salvation.²¹⁴

Is Dwight's emphasis on human responsibility consistent with the doctrine of justification and God's grace? Given the significance of the subject, one may say that the question here involves the entire structure of his soteriology. Actually, Dwight is not an

²¹² Dwight, "The Truth of God," *Theology*, 1:210-12 (italics not added). Dwight also states that changes happen when *certainty* appears. Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:376.

²¹³ Dwight, "Justification—The Duty of Believing," *Theology*, 2:318 (italics not added). In this sermon, he shows a paradigm of the soul. That is, the understanding precedes the will. Human beings act upon the will after the will catches motives. In this way, the will follows the mind after the mind perceives motives. *Ibid.*, 2:319; Dwight, "The Decrees of God," *Theology*, 1:256.

²¹⁴ For Edwards, as we saw, God's efficacious grace is the strongest motive.

isolated figure in highlighting the importance of human goodness. Most of the New Divinity men would not disclaim the moral value of human deeds. They would readily agree with Dwight on the issue. There is no doubt about the value of good works in salvation. But, at the same time, they denigrate the doctrines of original sin and moral inability in regeneration.²¹⁵ Dwight wrote a vindication of semi-Pelagian faith against Edwards, and promotes the ability of human goodness to accept the gospel with his concept of *voluntary* faith.²¹⁶ Edwards's doctrine of the will, on the contrary, excludes the concept of voluntary faith.²¹⁷ This does not lead to the exclusion of the strongest motive, however. There is indeed within the human response of faith to the strongest motive the element of moral value.²¹⁸ Viewed in this way, Dwight's soteriology appears to be a unique echoing of the semi-Pelagian view of God's grace in regeneration, in encouraging us to come to faith: "If we please to be saved, we shall *now* be saved."²¹⁹

Dwight does not show any sign of hesitation in emphasizing human ability in salvation, over against Edwards. Dwight argues that God's grace does not actually *influence* the heart of the wicked.²²⁰ It does not vindicate God's saving grace in

²¹⁵ Also, the doctrines of natural necessity and moral necessity in Edwards's soteriology are rejected by Dwight. Dwight eventually is inconsistent on the actual cause of moral actions. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:409-11; Guelzo, 225-28.

²¹⁶ Dwight, *Theology*, 1:211. God's moral character is the foundation of faith, for faith relies on God's truth, which is a part of God's moral character.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1:210-14.

²¹⁸ God's grace in justification is the strongest motive in Edwards's view, while Dwight includes some other motives, such as Christ's mediation and revelation. Dwight, "The Mercy of God," *Theology*, 1:224-25.

²¹⁹ Dwight, *Theology*, 1:260 (*italics not added*). As Sproul rightly points out, for the semi-Pelagian, God's grace is "necessary to assist the sinner in responding positively to God." R. C. Sproul, *Grace Unknown: The Heart of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 187.

²²⁰ Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:224; 1:260; 1:347; 1:462.

Edwards's soteriology, for the Holy Spirit actually *influences* the unbelieving heart as God's saving grace, that is, the strongest motive in Edwards's thought. For this reason, Edwards's idea of the strongest motive appears to be more powerful than that of Dwight and the New Divinity. Since man is a free agent, he can have a *certainty* that works by his own power: "I am as *intuitively certain*, that a something, denoted by the word *I* or *myself*, is a cause of certain effects; an agent, performing certain actions; as I am of any possible proposition."²²¹ Therefore, God's saving grace upon the heart of the wicked does not start the process of conversion, for human actions "are intuitively seen by" them "not to be effects of an extraneous cause, or of something beside themselves."²²²

To Dwight, essentially, neither God's efficacious grace nor his foreknowledge can *influence* the will to be accepted by God in salvation.²²³ Real changes in regeneration are actually caused by human freedom, although the mind receives the motives of changes after being perceived by mental inspection.²²⁴ Or rather, active human power is itself the cause and force of his act of regeneration. More likely, there is no relation between the motives and God's saving grace in Dwight's thought.²²⁵

²²¹ Dwight, "The Soul Not A Chain of Ideas and Exercises," *Theology*, 1:375.

²²² *Ibid.*, 1:375. A person is the standard of *certainty* in Dwight's doctrine of man. In other words, he or she is an *intuitive certainty*. Also, the intuition of freedom is the fundamental evidence of it, to Dwight. *Ibid.*, 1:256; Guelzo, 227.

²²³ Dwight, *Theology*, 1:256.

²²⁴ The motives provided by God may indirectly *influence* the will, but cannot actually change it. For Dwight, men have active power to make a decision. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:376; 2:203; Guelzo, 228. The motives indirectly influence human beings to produce certainty.

²²⁵ The word *influence* is very significant, for it may draw the line between the Old Calvinists (necessity) and the New Divinity men (certainty). The former supports the idea of motives that cause the will, and the latter motives that influence it. Guelzo, 238-39. The word *influence* is deeply rooted in Dwight's theology, and points to God's government in the New Divinity. The law of God is a rule of deed with which God governs his kingdom. Disobedience to God's law makes one guilty before God. The law of God is God's *preceptive* will. To Dwight, the gospel is another law. Dwight, "The Universality of Sin

Having the idea of active power in salvation, Dwight points out for the role of faith that faith is “the instrument of justification.”²²⁶ This view is clearly discussed in his sermons. Does Dwight’s position reject either the Reformer’s or Edwards’s understanding of the instrumental character of faith? Dwight does not speak of faith as an instrumentality in connection with justification, as it seems to do in Edwards’s soteriology.²²⁷ Edwards, too, affirms the instrumental character of faith in justification. Nonetheless, he does not think that justification is achieved by this voluntary work of faith, like Dwight. Despite Dwight’s frequent use of the concept of faith elsewhere, it should be noted that he never mentions the idea of *extra nos* in his sermons on justification, as does Edwards. When the word *faith* is used, it is used simply to affirm that the act of faith is “virtuous”:

The influence of truth cannot commence in our minds, until our faith in it has commenced.... Since, then, faith is a voluntary exercise of the mind; it follows that, whenever it is exercised towards moral objects, it is *virtuous*; is an effort of the mind, directed to the promotion of this immense good, which I have specified. To the degree, in which it may be thus *virtuous*, no limits can be affixed: but it may rise to such a height, as to occupy all the supposable powers of any Intelligent creature.²²⁸

Dwight comes to this conclusion regarding the righteousness of faith: “All virtue is nothing else, but voluntary obedience to truth” through faith.²²⁹ This shows no link

Proved by Man’s Rejection of the Word of God,” *Theology*, 1:449. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:450-51; Dwight, “Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement,” *Theology*, 1:202-203.

²²⁶ Dwight, *Theology*, 2:312. He also calls faith “the hinge, on which the whole evangelical system turns.” *Ibid.*, 2:313. Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 2:341-45.

²²⁷ Cf. Sproul, *Faith Alone*, 75; Murray, *Redemption*, 159.

²²⁸ Dwight, “Justification: The Duty of Believing,” *Theology*, 2:322 (italics added). Faith is the “emotion of the mind.” Dwight, “Justification: The Nature of Faith,” *Theology*, 2:236. These three words are used synonymously to affirm the necessity of faith in order for a person to be saved: emotion, trust, and confidence. Also, Dwight interprets the faith of Abraham in this way. *Ibid.*, 2:328-29; 1:426-27.

²²⁹ Dwight, *Theology*, 2:318. Cf. Dwight, *Theology*, 2:313; 2:326; 2:340.

between Edwards and Dwight regarding the instrumental character of faith. Nevertheless, Dwight seeks to defend the Puritan tradition in the doctrine of justification. When the word *faith* is used in conjunction with regeneration or justification, Edwards would disagree with him. Dwight probably tried to win the hearts of people with the idea of the emotion of the mind, for he declared that we can feel it in our heart.²³⁰ However, we cannot trust in our feelings of God's work within us. Dwight underscores the reality of confidence or feeling in their heart brought forth by faith for the justification of the wicked, but that is by no means the same thing as justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ alone.²³¹ As Dwight puts his trust in confidence or feeling within him, he subscribes to a synergistic doctrine of justification.²³²

Berkouwer is right in pointing out that the *mystery* of the correlation between faith and justification "really embraces the reality of human existence. The miracle of grace occurs in the act of or attitude of faith, the faith that is roused by the Holy Spirit."²³³ In contrast to Dwight, Edwards remains true to the Reformers' understanding of the correlation between faith and justification, as we discussed before, for his doctrine of justification comes from the doctrine of total depravity due to Adam's sin.²³⁴ Although

²³⁰ Rabinowitz, 86-89.

²³¹ Dwight teaches the exercise of faith. He emphasizes human *feeling* by the influence of virtuous motives to realize the glory and excellency of the Redeemer. Dwight, "In What Sense Mankind Are Justified by Works," *Theology*, 2:350.

²³² For the Reformers, however, justification is not just an act of God, but also an act of man. G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952), 93-96; Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 178. In this relation between faith and justification, both "God's and man's sides are mutually dependent and reciprocally effective." Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 178.

²³³ Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification*, 179.

Dwight refutes the moralistic view of Old Calvinists and Arminians, his sermons appear to support moralism. The Reformers and Edwards were dissatisfied with the idea of earning God's acceptance by doing good works. Although they do not disown the idea of works performed by the justified after the forensic declaration, human obedience can never be the foundation of justification. Justification by works is absolutely rejected by them, and then obedience can be considered as the fruit of saving faith.²³⁵ Human works do not earn justification.

Dwight also affirms the necessity of good works, explaining the epistle of James in the same manner as Edwards: "*It is evident from this discourse of St. James, that the religious character of all men is to be estimated by their works.*"²³⁶ But this statement on James should not be separated from the idea of saving faith in justification. There is no inconsistency, he maintains, in saying that human beings are obliged to "*love our neighbor*" and to say that they are "absolutely obliged to seek" their own "eternal life."²³⁷ Dwight presupposes the system of duty in the doctrine of sanctification, for God gives humanity the power of choice.²³⁸

²³⁴ Edwards rejects any possibility of earning salvation by human *preparation*. In contrast to Edwards, Dwight presents the idea that we have the power to *save* ourselves through our own preparation, saying that faith is "moral fitness." Saving faith is an act of obedience to God, using human power. Dwight, "The Duty of Believing," *Theology*, 2:314; Dwight, "In What Sense Mankind Are Justified by Works," *Theology*, 2:350; Dwight, "Regeneration—Its Attendants—Generally Considered," *Theology*, 2:447; Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, 191-92.

²³⁵ Sproul, *Willing*, 179-81.

²³⁶ Dwight, "In What Sense We Are Justified by Works," *Theology*, 2:357 (italics not added). See also *ibid.*, 350-56.

²³⁷ Dwight, "Consistency of Benevolence with Seeking Salvation," *Theology*, 2:490. Dwight never mentions the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to works by love. To Dwight, faith is an "affection of the heart." Dwight, *Theology*, 2:325-26; Dwight, "Regeneration: Brotherly Love," *Theology*, 2:497-506.

Since a person is justified by cooperating with God's grace, as Dwight clearly states, this justification comes partially through human works. For this reason, Dwight cannot rule out the scheme of moralistic semi-Pelagianism in justification.²³⁹ Justification for him is another name for this moralism, for morality becomes the basis for the gospel by emphasizing free will. *Justification by faith alone through Christ's imputed merit alone* in Dwight's thought becomes the practical equivalent of a moral relationship between God and his children, making justification something that attains self-righteousness.²⁴⁰

2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

In order to discuss adequately the notion of imputation in Dwight, one must first understand his doctrine of man, that is, how he explains the relation between Adam and his posterity, because it is closely related to the relation between Jesus Christ and believers. In soteriology, imputation is inseparable from justification.²⁴¹ Thus, before one examines the nature of imputation, he must first see how in Dwight imputation is even possible, in the light of the sinful nature of humanity. We will ask about Dwight's views on the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Of particular importance is the question: Does Dwight see a close connection between imputation and God's saving

²³⁸ Christ's example is "an universal system of good works" to Dwight. Dwight, "In What Sense We Are Justified by Works," *Theology*, 2:353.

²³⁹ Cf. Berk, 74-75; Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, 126-27.

²⁴⁰ Finally, it exalts self-glorification, rejecting God's righteousness. Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, 117-32, 143-51, 170-81.

grace? Having answered this, we can ask how God's grace is necessary and received by humanity.

It is very important to see how Dwight uses the word *imputatio*, for it will show us whether he uses it "not only in regard to original sin but especially in regard to the righteousness of Christ."²⁴² When Dwight speaks of human depravity, he uses the word "impute." The Reformers, as we have seen, used the word to describe God's grace in justification. Why does the word *impute* become so important in Dwight's doctrine of justification? His use of the term will reveal whether he stands in the line of the Reformers or of the New Divinity.

When discussing original sin, Dwight defines the word *impute*: "The Verb, λογίζομαι. ... rendered by the English word, *impute*, denotes originally, and always, *to reckon, to count, to reckon to the account of a man, to charge to his account.*"²⁴³ It is apparent that there is no difference in the meaning of imputation between Dwight and Edwards. However, Dwight argues that the guilt of Adam's first sin is *not transferable* to others, while Edwards stresses that it is imputed to all men. For example, Dwight says:

When I assert, that in consequence of the Apostacy of Adam all men have sinned; I do not intent, that the posterity of Adam are guilty of his transgression. Moral actions are not, so far as I can see, transferable from one being to another. The personal act of any agent is, in its very nature, the act of the agent solely; and incapable of being

²⁴¹ For the purpose of this study, we need to discuss the relationship between faith and the imputation of Christ's righteousness somewhere in this section, because that relationship will reveal how God imputes Christ's righteousness to the wicked in Dwight's doctrine of imputation.

²⁴² G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), 452. Imputation is a crucial issue in the Reformed view of justification. "Here we stand," Berkouwer rightly states, "at the very heart of the salvation of God: his *unspeakable Gift of completely unmerited grace*" (italics added). Ibid.

²⁴³ Dwight, "Human Depravity," *Theology*, 1:478 (italics not added).

participated by any other agent. Of course, the guilt of such a personal act is equally incapable of being transferred, or participated.²⁴⁴

With this *non-transferable* concept of guilt, Dwight's point in this section is crucial: he sees the inheritance of Adam's disposition to sin. The difference between Dwight and Edwards is that Dwight opposes the imputation of moral actions and Edwards takes his point in the *forensic* concept of *oneness*, which comes from a divine constitution.²⁴⁵ This concept of non-transferable guilt finally leads Dwight to believe that Adam's posterity is not punishable for the sin of Adam.²⁴⁶ Likewise, Dwight's concept of imputation never finds a *legal* connection between the act of Adam and the sinful nature of his posterity. Thus, there is no proof that Dwight has a federalist idea of the Adamic union. Rather he just admits that Adam's posterity will sin as Adam did.

The question as to what is transferred to Adam's posterity has caught Dwight's attention, and his answer depends upon the doctrine of human depravity. Dwight's understanding of human depravity after the Fall does not imply a real involvement of the whole human race in Adam's first sin, and is very similar to the view of the New Divinity. The *guilt* for Dwight is not imputed from Adam's first sin. Rather, it is caused by every human action. This explains why for Dwight every man is responsible for his

²⁴⁴ Ibid (italics not added).

²⁴⁵ Cf. Berkouwer, *Sin*, 454-57; Murray, *Imputation*, 42-64; Charles Cuninghame, *Timothy Dwight 1752-1817: A Biography* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), 321.

²⁴⁶ This is especially clear in Dwight's comment on Ezekiel 18:20: "*Neither do I intend, that the descendants of Adam are punished for his transgression. This doctrine is completely set aside by God himself, in Ezek. xviii. 20: The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father; neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him; and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. In this passage, I think, as explicitly as language will admit, declared, that no man shall be punished for the sin of another; particularly that the son shall not be punished for the sin of his father; and, by obvious, and, I think, irresistible implication, that the sons of Adam shall not be punished for the sins of this, their common, parent.*" Dwight, "Human Depravity," *Theology*, 1:479 (italics not added).

own sin, in the sense that each person determines his guilt by his own sinful actions. Men for Dwight are “the actor” of their own sin.²⁴⁷ This point is of no small importance in relation to the necessity of Christ’s atonement, which is required of all sinners. One may wonder how Dwight can admit that “if *Adam* had not fallen, Christ would not have redeemed mankind,” while he argues that guilt is “inherent” in the *action* of the wicked themselves.²⁴⁸

Probably the best place to begin a discussion of the relationship between Adam’s sin and his posterity is with his sermon on “The Universality of Sin.”²⁴⁹ In this sermon, Dwight attempts to deal with the effects of Adam’s sin on his posterity. *Hereditary depravity* and not the imputation of Adam’s sin is the issue; that is, a corrupt nature is inherited by his posterity in order for them to perform “voluntary transgression.”²⁵⁰ He indicates a certain connection between Adam’s first sin and the sinfulness of his posterity.²⁵¹ Dwight continues the discussion by mentioning an analogy in which he refers to the *likeness* of Adam:

The likeness of Adam is, by unquestionable analogy, the moral character which he possessed after his apostacy. In this likeness Seth is said to have been begotten. That Cain was begotten in the same likeness will not be disputed. The same thing is indirectly, but decisively asserted also concerning Abel: for he is declared to have lived, and died, in faith, that is, in the future Redeemer.... But, if this was the nature

²⁴⁷ Dwight, “The Temptation and Fall,” *Theology*, 1:414-15.

²⁴⁸ Dwight, “Providence: The Temptation and Fall,” *Theology*, 1:415; Dwight, “Justification by the Free Grace of God,” *Theology*, 2:306; Dwight, “Universality of Sin,” *Theology*, 1:436-37.

²⁴⁹ Dwight, “Universality of Sin,” *Theology*, 1:435-47.

²⁵⁰ This is basically from the New Divinity theology, which teaches the mediate imputation of Adam’s sin. But as Murray points out, in their view there is “no imputation of Adam’s sin to posterity either *mediately* or *immediately*.” Murray, *Imputation*, 48. See also *ibid.*, 49-53.

²⁵¹ Dwight’s doctrine of human depravity is very similar to that of Samuel Hopkins (a New Divinity man). Murray, *Imputation*, 48-51.

of the immediate children of Adam, it cannot even be suspected, that it is not equally the nature of his remoter progeny.²⁵²

First of all, Dwight answers that everyone is born in Adam's moral likeness after the Fall. Rather than a concern for guilt and punishment, we see here a concern for the inheritance of Adam's moral likeness. He does this by explaining human depravity as a divine constitution of "likeness."²⁵³ The question Dwight has to answer is clear: Does human depravity result from the first sin of Adam after the Fall? Dwight denies the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, while agreeing that hereditary depravity results from the moral character of Adam after the Fall.²⁵⁴ Dwight rejects the idea of the *forensic* imputation of Adam's guilt to his posterity. He departs from the Calvinistic notion of human depravity, as well as from Edwards's position. Yet he does assert in one way or another that human depravity comes from Adam's first sin:

It follows therefore, that, as the world was thus changed in consequence of the transgression of Adam; and of a paradise became a wilderness of thorns and briars: so, in consequence of the same transgression, the character of Man was also changed; and instead of being immortal, virtuous, and happy, he became the subject of sin, suffering, and death.²⁵⁵

What does he mean by saying that human character is changed after the Fall?

Does he mean that man is a sinner as a result of the forensic imputation of Adam's sin?

No, he means that man is a sinner because the sinfulness of Adam is passed on to him.

²⁵² Dwight, "Universality of Sin," *Theology*, 1:437 (italics not added). After the Fall, Adam lost the image of God, such as "divine knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness." Ibid., 436. Dwight also calls the image of God either the *likeness* of God or the *moral* image of God. Dwight also see a sign of duty in the faith of Abel. Dwight, "Human Depravity; Depravity from Adam," *Theology*, 1:481.

²⁵³ He argues that "After Adam had lost the image of God, we are informed, that he begat a son in his own likeness." Dwight, "Universality of Sin," *Theology*, 1:436 (italics not added). Also, men have the moral character of Adam after the Fall. Ibid., 1:436-37.

²⁵⁴ Dwight, "Universality of Sin," *Theology*, 1:436-37 (italics not added).

²⁵⁵ Dwight, "Human Depravity, Derived from Adam," *Theology*, 1:481 (italics not added).

How do they become sinners? While Dwight concedes that human depravity derives from the first sin of Adam, he seeks to connect Adams's sin with his posterity through their *fleshly character*:

"Accordingly, our Savior declares universally, that, *that which is born of the flesh, is flesh*; and that, that only, *which is born of the Spirit, or born again, is spirit*. In this declaration he certainly teaches us, that *the fleshly character is inseparably connected with the birth of man*: it being an invariable attendant of that birth. In other words, every parent, as truly as Adam, begets children *in his own moral likeness*. It hardly needs to be observed, that the moral character, denoted, in this observation of our Savior, by the term *flesh*, is a corrupt character."²⁵⁶

Every man inherits the moral character of corruption from his parent. This shows that hereditary depravity is passed on from generation to generation.²⁵⁷ This can be called a "law of generation."²⁵⁸ To Dwight, men share the corrupted *moral character* of their parents.²⁵⁹ He concludes, "As all the progeny of *Adam* must inhabit the world thus cursed; all must necessarily *partake* of these evils; because they were inseparably united to the world, in which they dwelt."²⁶⁰ When Dwight discusses human depravity, he speaks of a *certain* relation between Adam's first sin and the sinful nature of humanity.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 1:482 (italics not added).

²⁵⁷ Cf. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), 238.

²⁵⁸ It is a kind of theory that "differs only in terms from the doctrine of La Place," since Josua Placaeus teaches that "original sin consisted in the depravity derived from Adam and did not include the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin." Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 2:214; Murray, *Imputation*, 42.

²⁵⁹ Murray disagrees on the "law of generation": "But natural generation is not the reason why we are conceived in sin. It is not an adequate explanation of our depravity to say that by the law of generation like begets like and since Adam became depraved it was inevitable that he should beget children in the same depraved condition." Murray, *Imputation*, 92. He claims that "neither are we to posit any such notion as the transfer from Adam to us of the moral character involved in his trespass." Ibid., 86.

²⁶⁰ Dwight, "Human Depravity, Deprived from Adam," *Theology*, 1:480-81 (italics added).

However, while he argues that man is divinely constituted to be a sinner by hereditary depravity, he does not show the solidaric unity of Adam and his posterity like Edwards.

It is at this point that Dwight invokes the New Divinity concept of *hereditary depravity*, which eventually does not explain the imputation of Adam's guilt to his descendants.²⁶¹ Certainly, there is good reason to believe that Dwight's thought raises a misunderstanding, for with his thought one can "easily conclude that hereditary corruption is the real foundation of our original guilt."²⁶² It is important to note that if we accept Dwight's claim, "we could end up with the thought of an *imputatio mediata*, as taught" by Placaeus."²⁶³ For Dwight, in the sinful condition of humanity after the Fall, it is our *duty* to fight against every temptation and to be influenced by the motives to obedience. A person commits sins when he is inclined to follow the motives to disobedience.²⁶⁴ Freedom remains, but it is only freedom to choose, by an act of faith,

²⁶¹ Guelzo speaks of the imputation of the New Divinity: "To dismiss our just condemnation as sinners under God's law with a legal fiction was as subversive of God's moral government as the infliction of imputed guilt without actual transgression." Guelzo, 131. Thus, "If guilt could not be imputed without emptying it of personal reality, neither could righteousness." Ibid., 130. In this sense, the New Divinity men believe that Adam's sin affected the will only, not the mind. They claim that *hereditary depravity* is the "medium" of imputation. For this doctrine of mediate imputation, they admit that Adam's sin was not actually transferred to his posterity. Murray, *Imputation*, 48-64.

²⁶² Berkouwer, *Sin*, 474. Here Berkouwer deals with Polman's article on the Belgic Confession and warns against his analysis that may result in an inappropriate conclusion, as we saw in Dwight's theology.

²⁶³ Ibid. As Dwight argues in one place, Adam and Eve are cursed as the result of the Fall. Both the world and the soul are involved in this punishment as *partakers* of the divine declaration. Although he shows a certain connection between Adam's first sin and his posterity, he speaks that it is *impossible* to explain the relation between original sin and human depravity. Dwight, *Theology*, 1:480.

²⁶⁴ As discussed above, there are two motives to choose from: motives to obedience, and motives to disobedience. Dwight is emphatic that there is a moment of choice in which the will has to respond with its own power: "What is true of them, is true of all their posterity. The very act of deliberating, results from want of sufficient faith in God, and sufficient firmness in our duty. In our deliberations, also, we are exposed to many dangers.... In our love to sin, we have an enemy within us, of whose presence, or even existence, we are usually not aware, ever ready to aid assaults of the enemy without." Dwight, "Providence—The Temptation and Fall," *Theology*, 1:418. Dwight applies this pattern of temptation to Adam and his posterity. This is how men commit sin.

among evil *temptations*. Later, the issue of duty for Dwight turns out to be a person's ability to perform free acts even in salvation. It is noted that the role of free choice is nothing more than consent to God's redemptive work in Christ.

In summary, according to Dwight, after the Fall there is no immediate imputation of Adam's guilt and pollution. Freedom of choice remains in a certain sense, and it is not impotent as the result of Adam's sin, since the *habitual sin* of Adam is passed on to his children.²⁶⁵ Throughout this discussion, Dwight speaks of mankind depraved by a certain *moral* nature. The corrupted *moral character* of Adam after the Fall has been passed on from generation to generation. This fails to establish the legal connection between Adam and his posterity and eventually weakens the necessity of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.²⁶⁶

Dwight, then, is consistent in maintaining that either the moral *image* or the moral *likeness* of Adam after the Fall is inherent in all men. For the purposes of this study, what is important is that Dwight recognizes some kind of open *opportunity* for the acceptance of God's grace in justification after the Fall. For him, there is freedom given to us by God, which belongs to our natural condition, and this is another way of speaking of free choice in salvation. Even the first sin of Adam does not change this, for it is given

Does this mean, then, that we have no freedom to choose God's grace in salvation? Dwight's answer is plainly *no*. There is no way in which the will does not have power to decide. Before the Fall, Adam had *perfect freedom*. However, men, including Adam and Eve, have the same will, which is "a subject of either virtue or sin" after the Fall. Dwight, "Providence—The Temptation and Fall," *Theology*, 1:414-17.

²⁶⁵ Dwight calls spiritual death "habitual sin." Dwight, "The Sentence Pronounced on Man," *Theology*, 1:427.

²⁶⁶ Dwight's analogy between father and son or the unbelieving husband and the believing wife fails to prove the solidaric oneness either between Adam and his posterity or between Christ and the believer. Dwight, "Human Depravity; Derived From Adam," *Theology*, 1:479.

as our duty to make a good use of God's grace. Thus, Dwight's hereditary depravity from generation to generation does not necessitate the saving grace of the Holy Spirit for the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness. This idea makes him unable to prove the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ. In this case, we must ask: Is there another way that Dwight can elucidate the cause of human depravity?

Dwight describes the cause of human depravity as a *divine institution* by which humanity inherits Adam's sin. In his sermon on human depravity, Dwight insists that this does not compromise his position on the doctrine of original sin. He offers some explanation of the most significant verse in the doctrine of imputation, Romans 5:19:

*Therefore, as by the offense of one, or as in the original, δι' ενος παραπτώματος, by one offense, judgment came upon all unto condemnation; and in the 19th verse, By one man's obedience, many, in the original, οι πολλοι the many, were made, in the Greek, κατεσυνθησαν, were constituted, sinners. The meaning of the passage is, I think, plainly the following: that by means of the offense, or transgression of Adam, the judgment, or sentence of God, came upon all men unto condemnation; because, and solely because, all men, in that state of things, which was constituted in consequence of the transgression of Adam, became sinners.*²⁶⁷

As far as understanding the nature of the consequence of Adam's sin is concerned, Edwards and Dwight both use the term *divine constitution*. These words are used to prove that all men become sinners. Dwight describes the universality of sin as the sin of all men "by one man" (Romans 5:12) to indicate the point.²⁶⁸ He affirms the same point when he interprets 1 Corinthians 15:22 to explain that "all men die in Adam."²⁶⁹

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 1:479 (italic not added).

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 1:478-79. Dwight interprets the passage as "by means of one man, sin entered into the world."

²⁶⁹ Although Dwight demonstrates the notion of the unity of mankind, he does not use it in terms of solidarity with Adam like Edwards. On the solidarity with Adam, Murray's claim is true that "depravity may not be conceived of so much as a penal infliction arising from the imputation of Adam's sin but as an implicate of solidarity with Adam in his sin." Murray, *Imputation*, 90.

However, unlike Edwards, Dwight does not accept the traditional Reformed formula that expresses the solidaric relationship of Adam and his posterity and of Jesus Christ and his people.²⁷⁰ Rather, Dwight speaks of two *instrumental* causes, death *by means of* Adam and life *by means of* Christ: “*as by means of Adam all die, even so by means of Christ shall all be made alive.*”²⁷¹ Dwight is speaking of the actual sin of all men *by means of* Adam. In relation to his idea of *propagation* in hereditary depravity, as we saw, he means here that men are sinners *by means of* Adam’s sin from generation to generation. Therefore, he refuses to see imputation in the sense of *legal* union. To him, there is no such thing as either *legal* union with Adam or *legal* union with Christ, through which we partake of the sin of Adam or of the redemptive work of Christ. It is an instrumental cause by which we become sinners with Adam’s sin through *biological* or *genetic* relationship.²⁷² His understanding of the *divine institution* in biological nature disregards its relation to the *legal* imputation to Adam’s posterity like Edwards. As Dwight does not use the notion of divine institution in the forensic sense of *solidarity*, he does not adopt either the *realistic* view of it or the *representative* view.²⁷³ Rather, Dwight’s understanding of *mediate* imputation denies Paul’s idea that the sin of all men has a “direct relation to the sin of Adam.”²⁷⁴

This forensic solidarity between Adam and his posterity is very important that it

²⁷⁰ Dwight, “Human Depravity; Derived From Adam,” *Theology*, 1:479-80. Cf. H. Shelton Smith, *Changing Conceptions of Original Sin: A Study of American Theology Since 1750* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1955), 66-67.

²⁷¹ Dwight, “Human Depravity; Derived from Adam,” *Theology*, 1:479 (italic not added).

²⁷² Cf. Murray, *Imputation*, 49-51.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 24-41; Berkouwer, *Sin*, 436-65.

will eventually reveal the necessity of the imputation of Christ's righteousness through a different solidarity between Christ and the believer.²⁷⁵ Later, Dwight does not see the importance of the solidarity between Christ and all believers. Dwight's doctrine of mediate imputation conflicts with Paul's doctrine of justification, as John Murray explains in *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* that the *union* with Christ is the foundation of the imputation of Christ's righteousness:

*The analogy supports immediate imputation.... To use the language of imputation, it is not by mediate imputation that believers come into the possession of the righteousness of Christ in justification.... The one ground upon which the imputation of the righteousness of Christ becomes ours is the union with Christ. In other words, the justified person is constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ because of the solidarity established between Christ and the justified person.*²⁷⁶

After denying the Pauline *forensic* connection between Adam and his posterity as he rejects the imputation of Adam's guilt, Dwight also does not see the *forensic* connection between Christ and believers in the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. However, it is interesting to see that he acknowledges that justification has to do with a legal matter of the divine Judge. It seems that there would be no dispute between Edwards and Dwight, if one sees *forensic* justification as a legal declaration:

We are said to be justified by the grace of God, through the redemption of Christ Jesus.... The person, accused, being upon trial found innocent of the charge, is declared to be just, in the view of the Law; and, by an easy and natural figure, is said to be justified; that is, made just. In this original, forensic sense of the term, it is

²⁷⁴ Murray, *Imputation*, 69. Here Murray calls all men "constituted sinners."

²⁷⁵ Here, we should be well aware of *contrasts* as well as *parallelism* as Murray says: "In the nature of the case [Rom. 5:12-19 shows that "the central structure is the analogy"], since the latter complex [the *modus operandi* of righteousness, justification, life] is for the purpose of negating the first [that of sin, condemnation, death], there are significant and magnificent contrasts, and on these Paul elaborates. But the central strand is the parallelism, and even the contrasts are based upon this substructure." *Ibid.*, 19-20.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

obvious from what has been said in a former discourse, that no human being can be justified by the law, or before the bar, of God.²⁷⁷

Here Dwight does not disregard the idea that God declares *legally* the wicked *just*. In the terminology of justification, this is God's *legal declaration*. The wicked are legally justified when God declares them righteous. This act of God is a "forensic justification" to Dwight.²⁷⁸ It seems that Dwight's position is not too far from that of the Reformers.²⁷⁹ In the same sermon, Dwight insists on "the impossibility of justification by our own obedience."²⁸⁰ He recognizes that human meritorious works cannot change God's judgment. "They are in no sense justified on account of their own righteousness; but solely by the free grace of God, on account of the righteousness of Christ," says Dwight.²⁸¹ The unregenerate can be justified by God's grace.

Then, does God's grace affect the wicked? A closer look at Dwight's thoughts on justification reveals a real difference between Edwards and him. Both agree that God declares the wicked *just*. Nevertheless, they differ radically on the ground of God's legal declaration. Fundamental to Dwight's thought on regeneration is the governmental theory of the Christ's atonement. This is important because the atonement is closely related to *forensic* justification, as Sproul helps us to see:

The atonement also involves a forensic matter. God declares Christ to be "guilty" of sin after the Son willingly bears for his people sins that are imputed or transferred to him. Here is imputation with a vengeance—indeed a divine vengeance. This forensic

²⁷⁷ Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," *Theology*, 2:300-301 (italics not added).

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 301.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 2:301-302.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 307.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 304-308.

act of imputed punishment is the very heart of the New Testament message. With no pun intended it is the *crux* of the matter.²⁸²

For Dwight, the imputed merit of Christ is not the ground of justification, for the free grace of God through Christ is subordinate to the primary purpose of God's moral government. In this system, as discussed before, God declares the wicked *just*. On what basis, then, does God declare the wicked *just*? In the words of Dwight, a *legal* declaration depends on human obedience to the moral law of God. All men are given sufficient volition to voluntarily assent to God's law through faith (in Dwight's forensic sense). Thus, all men must take responsibility for their own decisions. Through the powers of the understanding and the will, humanity has true freedom to obey the will of the Ruler.²⁸³ This disposition after the Fall is the ability to make an acceptable choice by perceiving a new law, that is, the gospel, and to exercise the free will that one receives.²⁸⁴ The unregenerate may possess the benefits of God's free grace on the basis of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. This explains why Dwight regards human obedience as meaningful. The grace of God in justification is rejected by Dwight. For Dwight, *forensic declaration* means nothing but God's acceptance *following* "the making inwardly just" of the unregenerate through obedience.²⁸⁵ Such a notion of God's free grace leaves no room for the imputed righteousness of Christ, for forensic declaration does not follow the forensic

²⁸² Sproul, *Faith*, 104 (italics not added).

²⁸³ Dwight, "Attributes of God—The Justice of God," *Theology*, 1:199. Also, for Dwight, the law of God is "a rule of action." See Dwight, "The Priesthood of Christ: His Atonement, Its Existence," *Theology*, 2:202.

²⁸⁴ He claims: "The proposals of the Gospel are, therefore, not merely declarations, or promises; but a Law; compliance with which is the highest duty of Mankind." Dwight, "Universality of Sin," *Theology*, 1:451.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Sproul, *Faith*, 97-98.

imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. This human obedience is what Dwight calls "the highest duty" for all men.²⁸⁶ Salvation in this system results from absolute freedom, not God's free grace.

Before we move on to discuss further the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, some questions must be addressed in order to understand Dwight's concept of justification, for he teaches that "the Holy Spirit is the only author of Regeneration of Man."²⁸⁷ Is the change of the human will the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration? Does the Holy Spirit work in human nature for the justification of the wicked? Dwight explains, "*Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.*"²⁸⁸ Apart from Dwight's interpretation, this statement would seem to conflict with what we have already seen, where he speaks of human freedom to carry out the highest duty. However, what Dwight means by "regeneration" is "the renovation of man" or "the implantation of holiness in his heart."²⁸⁹ Here Dwight uses *regeneration* synonymously with *sanctification*. Now, Dwight thinks that we are *regenerated* by the work of the Holy Spirit. But, he says, the Holy Spirit can work fittingly only in an obedient mind. The Spirit gives the *renewing power* to the justified, who are already accepted by God

²⁸⁶ We discussed this point in the previous section.

²⁸⁷ Dwight, "Depravity of Man: Remarks," *Theology*, 1:501. Dwight also denies the idea of *supererogatory* merit in salvation.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 1:501 (italics not added).

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 1:501. In this discussion, Dwight maintains that the *renewing power* of the Holy Spirit is absolutely necessary because of "human depravity."

through an act of free will.²⁹⁰ In support of his argument, Dwight repeatedly speaks in this context of the renewing power of the Spirit:

Regeneration regularly follows such prayers, and being regularly communicated to the subjects of them, in the course of God's Providence, whenever it exists at all. To convinced sinners [the justified], crying to God for mercy, Regeneration is communicated by the Spirit of God; and we are not, I think, warranted to conclude, that it is given to any others [the wicked].²⁹¹

To Edwards, regeneration is synonymous with the efficacious work of the Holy Spirit in justification. The work of the Holy Spirit in justification therefore involves the close relationship between the word and the Spirit, in which faith's function is to justify us as it looks away from the self to Christ.²⁹² But in Dwight's concept of the work of the Holy Spirit in justification, justification follows and belongs to human responsibility as the necessary ingredient of saving faith. This *kind* of faith fits right into Dwight's arguments in his other sermons on the highest duty, in which he puts emphasis on moral ability, not on *sola gratia* in justification. Throughout his discussion, Dwight remains unpersuaded of the necessity of the divine initiative in justification, for his view of the *forensic* character of justification lies deep in the doctrine of the self-determining power of humanity. It appears that he does have a forensic view of justification, but he has an analytical view of justification. His view of forensic justification, involving the governmental theory of atonement, brings in the mediate imputation of Adam's sin. To understand Dwight's view of justification, it is crucial to recognize that his conclusion is

²⁹⁰ Ibid., 1:503.

²⁹¹ Dwight, "Regeneration: Its Attendants," *Theology*, 2:449. Cf. Dwight's 17 sermons on regeneration: Dwight, *Theology*, 2:370-558.

²⁹² In Edwards's doctrine of justification, faith is the sole *instrument* by which we rest in Christ; by grace alone does faith look away from the self to Christ. In this sense, Edwards follows the Reformed teachings.

drawn from his doctrine of the mediate imputation of Adam's sin.²⁹³ Dwight sees the action of the fallen will as it is able to obtain a true goodness before God, and then God's *forensic* act of justification is based on it. It is clear that both the Reformers and Edwards sought to demolish self-glorification and to praise *solī Deo gloria* with *sola fide–sola gratia* in their doctrine of the *forensic* declaration of God, while Dwight actually brings in self-praise with his doctrine of justification and then rules out the notion of *sola gratia* in forensic justification.²⁹⁴

This position is the result of Dwight's assertion that the human will can cooperate with God in salvation, since God is willing to save all through the act of the will. He asserts that all the declarations of God's mercy in salvation must "*be believed by us.*"²⁹⁵ This is the way in which Dwight encourages people to use their ability to obtain salvation.²⁹⁶ He does not promote the idea of God's sovereign grace working at the

²⁹³ As we have seen previously, with his doctrine of original sin Dwight comes to the conclusion that faith, as the "voluntary exercise of the mind," reveals a moralistic push. The moral character of God plays an important role in his thought, for the will ought to act toward it. Dwight, "Justification—The Duty of Believing," *Theology*, 2:313; Dwight, "Justification—The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:326-29; Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," 2:310-13.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Berkouwer, *Faith and Sanctification*, 82-85, 117-26.

²⁹⁵ Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," *Theology*, 2:310-11 (italics not added). See also Dwight, "The Decrees of God," *Theology*, 1:257-62. Cf. Cuninghame, 328. Dwight insists that God's foreknowledge provides men with absolute freedom. In the doctrine of justification, God's foreknowledge has nothing to do with the act of human freedom, according to Dwight. Cf. Wayne C. Tyner, "The Theology of Timothy Dwight in Historical Perspective" (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, 1971), 238-40.

²⁹⁶ Dwight, *Theology*, 2:446-52; Cuninghame, 328; Keith J. Hardman, *Seasons of Refreshing: Evangelism and Revivals in America* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 115-17; Norman Pettit, *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 3-6; Berk, 94. Dwight's concept of preparationism is very similar to that of the Old Calvinists in following traditional New England Puritanism, for they believed that the wicked can prepare themselves for a process of salvation. The difference between them is in Dwight's stress on emotional experience through revivals. However, Edwards and the New Divinity men rejected this Puritan preparationism in salvation. For them, salvation results from the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit. Pettit, 209; Guelzo, 106-108, 122-23.

beginning of regeneration. Indeed, he reaches the conclusion that justification becomes the reward of human actions. The important thing to notice here is that the operation of the Holy Spirit for the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness is meaningless in Dwight's thought, in which justification is seen as conditional. The connection between justification and God's grace must be further explained in light of Dwight's concept of imputation.

Dwight, as we said before, denies the imputation of Adam's guilt to the whole human race, although there is a *certain* connection between Adam and his posterity in his theology. Dwight presents the notion of *divine constitution* in *biological* nature, but fails to make a cogent argument because of his unclear and inconsistent explanation. He also uses this concept of divine constitution to explain the relationship between Christ and the believer. The first constitution comes into play when a person inherits the corrupted nature of Adam by divine constitution. The second constitution comes in when a believer is saved through divine constitution by God. The person is saved *by means of* Christ, without regard to the legal *union* between Christ and the believer. He speaks of a similar concept of divine constitution to explain the imputation of Christ's righteousness:

*With the heart, says St. Paul, man believeth unto righteousness. Rom. x.10. This passage would be more literally translated, With the heart faith exists unto righteousness, that is, the faith which is accounted to man for righteousness, or which is productive of righteousness in the life, hath its seat in the heart; and the heart in this exercise co-operates with the understanding. In the former of these senses, the faith itself is called, Rom. iv. 13, the righteousness of faith; the faith being a righteous or virtuous exercise.*²⁹⁷

Righteousness is *accounted* to a person, Dwight says, as he comes to the actual exercise of his disposition in faith. This is indeed an interesting remark for a New Haven

²⁹⁷ Dwight, "Justification: The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:326 (italics not added).

theologian to make, for Dwight's view of righteousness in justification, one might say, appears to be presented in the sense of the imputation of Christ's righteousness: through faith alone Christ's righteousness is *accounted* to the believer. However, Dwight goes on further to explain the righteousness of faith. The "affection of the heart" is "counted" to the person for righteousness.²⁹⁸ Regeneration can occur, therefore, at the moment of the actual exercise of faith. How can the actual exercise of faith be *reckoned* to the wicked for righteousness? The act of faith as *the source of obedience* must be exercised after a person understanding the truth, and in that sense this act is considered as a necessary condition for salvation.²⁹⁹ The act of faith precedes regeneration regardless of God's grace or the imputed merit of Christ, and this act eventually turns out to be the source of justification in Dwight's thought. Regeneration is effected by the act of faith when man exercises his will to earn God's favor in justification.

Dwight's arguments in his sermons focus on the act of faith as our duty to obtain righteousness. The righteousness of Christ can be obtained through *divine constitution* by faith. The use of this duty by Dwight is crucial, for it makes clear that he sees a bond between Christ and the believer to obtain the righteousness of Christ through the obedient

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 2:326. It must be noted that for Dwight faith in the Old Testament is the same as the faith of the gospel, since Christ is the immediate object of faith in both Testaments. To Dwight, there is consistency between the Old Testament and the New Testament in the imputation of righteousness. In this scheme, faith becomes our duty in the gospel. Accordingly, the wicked must obey the word of Christ and believe in Christ's righteousness. Ibid., 2:324-37.

²⁹⁹ In Dwight's conception of disposition, as we said before, the will follows the mind after the will picks up motives through the mind. The will, in other words, acts upon motives. In this paradigm, the will dominates understanding, and the former is preceded by the latter. Dwight, "Justification: The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:328, 333 (faith: confidence, trust); "Justification: The Influence of Faith in Our Justification," *Theology*, 2:344 (faith: the source of obedience); "Justification: The Duty of Believing," *Theology*, 2:316 (the active power of the mind); *Theology*, 2:321 (faith: an effort of the mind); "Justification: Reconciliation of Paul and James," *Theology*, 2:355 (faith: the real power); "Justification: The Influence of Faith in Our Justification," *Theology*, 2:338; "Justification: The Duty of Believing," *Theology*, 2:319 (the duty of belief).

response to the highest duty by faith. This obedient act of duty by faith determines the entire structure of Dwight's doctrine of imputation, which must be inspired by the New Divinity, for the New Divinity remains convinced that "our faith—not Christ's righteousness—is really what is imputed to us for righteousness."³⁰⁰ Therefore, when Dwight says that faith is "imputed" to a person "for righteousness," or that a person is "justified freely by the grace of God," he does not have in view a justification by the imputed merit of Christ alone.³⁰¹ What Dwight means by imputation does not imply the federal headship of Adam or Christ, unlike Edwards. The word *imputation* for Dwight is neither a covenantal term nor a forensic one like Edwards, but a moralistic one, and is best rendered as "constitution" or "grace."³⁰² Dwight explains this briefly:

If he believes in the righteousness of Christ, and the acceptableness of it to God, as the foundation of pardon and peace to sinners; he believes, or trusts, in it, only because it is the righteousness of just such a person.... The faith of the Gospel, whatever may be its immediate object, is no other than confidence in the moral character of God, especially of the Redeemer.... *Confidence or trust, is a complex emotion of the mind; and involves good-will to its object.*³⁰³

With respect to righteousness, Dwight's understanding of the function of faith is not parallel to Edwards's understanding of freedom in moral inability; that is, in Dwight the act of faith does not show the work of the Holy Spirit as a saving grace for the imputed righteousness of Christ. For Edwards, the human will in the state of sin after the Fall is absolutely powerless to do anything to obtain saving grace in justification. Dwight,

³⁰⁰ Guelzo, 133. As we saw before, it is not our faith that justifies us, but the content of our faith in Christ Jesus.

³⁰¹ Dwight, "Justification: The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:330; Dwight, "Justification by the Free Grace of God," *Theology*, 300-301, 306-308.

³⁰² Dwight, *Theology*, 1:479-80, 2:300-301; 2:320-23; 2:341; 1:437.

³⁰³ Dwight, "Justification: The Nature of Faith," *Theology*, 2:333 (italics not added).

however, gives the fallen will the moral ability to *cooperate* with God's grace in justification, insisting that faith connects the righteousness of Christ and the believer, disregarding the work of the Holy Spirit. This Dwight thinks to be properly called "moral union" to God:

*This confidence [faith] is plainly the beginning, and the continuance, of union and attachment to our Creator [the moral character of God]; while, on the other hand, distrust is a complete separation of the soul from the Author of its being. It is plainly impossible for him, who distrusts God, to have any moral union to him, or any devotion to his pleasure. Confidence is also the highest honour, which an Intelligent creature can render to his Creator.*³⁰⁴

This notion of *moral union* is crucial to the understanding of Dwight's doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, for it clearly shows that he completely excludes *sola gratia* from imputation and replaces it with *moral ability*. Thus, the *confidence* [faith] in this *moral union* belongs under the imputation of Christ's righteousness by grace as some kind of ability that still remains in the fallen will. It is primarily in Dwight's treatment of moral union that he connects the righteousness of Christ with the believer.

Dwight's concept of moral union does not agree with Edwards's claim that *legal* union with Christ is achieved by grace alone through faith alone. For Edwards, as we have seen, the Holy Spirit effects this faith. He stresses the Holy Spirit as the bond of union with Christ. The solidarity between Adam and his posterity in his sin explains why Adam's sin is imputed to them. A similar explanation is given by Edwards for the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Dwight does not see faith in connection with a *legal* union with Christ. What, then, is the nature of moral union for Dwight? Dwight

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 2:335 (italics added).

wants to speak of moral union in relation to faith, God, and the gospel. The question now is what is God's reaction to the act of faith. God yields Christ's righteousness to the voluntary moral act of sinners. The moral act by faith plays a role of moral union between Christ's righteousness and the sinners since it satisfies the demands of God in Dwight's doctrine of justification. Commenting on this reaction of God, Dwight states:

That faith is the true source of such obedience, in all its forms and degrees, is so completely proved by St. Paul in the xi. Chapter of the Epistle of *Hebrews*, as to admit of no debate, and to demand no further illustration.... How, then, can man be justified by his obedience? But, by annexing Justification to faith, God has removed all these difficulties and dangers. It is rendered as easy, as possible, to our attainment.³⁰⁵

This statement wipes out the concept of *legal union* from Dwight's theory of justification. Dwight's rejection of the idea of *legal union* is most clearly expressed here. He is referring here to what happens in the act of faith. It is *divine duty* to grant justification to the act of faith, while faith is *human duty*, as the means of *divine constitution*, in justification.³⁰⁶ Dwight clearly denies the effect of the work of the Holy Spirit in the imputation of Christ's righteousness. God yields Christ's righteousness as an immediate result upon the act of faith, and faith always remains independent of God's grace. In other words, God's grace in the imputation of Christ's righteousness is based on human action. For Dwight, the gospel is a part of the commands of God to which a person must respond in order for him to receive God's blessings. Dwight sees faith as the "real power" in the sense of *divine constitution*, while Edwards sees a *legal union* between Christ and the believer, effected by the Holy Spirit, in connection with the

³⁰⁵ Dwight, "Justification: The Influence of Faith in Our Justification," *Theology*, 2:344-46 (italics not added).

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 2:341-47. In this sense, faith turns out to be a moral obligation to Dwight.

federal headship of Christ.³⁰⁷ When Dwight brings up the question of the exact nature of obedience in faith, he insists that a person “becomes fitted” for God’s acceptance. If this is true, his concept of moral union can be called “moral fitness”:

Faith, fixing its eye on the unmerited and boundless goodness of God, sees, in the great act of Justification, faithfulness, truth, and mercy, displayed, to which it neither finds, nor wishes to find, limits. *The soul*, in the contemplation of what itself has been, and what it has received, *becomes fitted*, through this confidence [faith], for every thing excellent, and every thing desirable.³⁰⁸

To summarize, it appears that by the act of faith “moral union” or “moral fitness” embraces both the righteousness of Christ and the soul of the believer. The act of faith is an act of the will and bonds the righteousness of Christ to the believer. Once the highest duty is performed by the will, God connects the righteousness of Christ with the believer. This Dwight calls a *moral union*. In this moral connection there is no notion of an efficacious grace of God that can change the unbelieving heart to accept Jesus Christ by the work of the Holy Spirit. It is evident that Dwight is not inspired by Edwards’s monergistic view of God’s grace.

On the basis of this analysis, it is evident that Dwight is not fascinated with the orthodox doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. While his concept of imputation is emphatically man-centered, he is not opposed to speaking of the divine

³⁰⁷ The real power of faith must be exercised for the justification of the wicked, because it has ability to obey the word of God. Thus, it is not the gift of God, as taught by Calvin and Edwards. Dwight never accepts the federal headship of Adam. Dwight, “Human Depravity; Derived from Adam,” *Theology*, 1:479-480; Dwight, “The Temptation and Fall,” *Theology*, 1:406, 425; “The Chief End of Man,” *Theology*, 1:384.

³⁰⁸ Dwight, “Justification: The Influence of Faith in Our Justification,” *Theology*, 2:346 (italics added). As we discussed before, for Dwight faith is “moral fitness.” Dwight, “The Duty of Believing,” *Theology*, 2:314. Therefore, it is apparent that his moral union can be called *moral fitness*. Here Dwight shows the moral character of God. As I discussed previously, the will must act toward the moral character of God, according to Dwight. It is not surprising for him to present his moralistic idea of faith here, that “evangelical faith is the emotion of the mind.” Cf. Berk, 84-85.

Judge who sends the mediator, Christ, with whose righteousness we are connected by the act of faith. However, Dwight gives different roles to the act of faith in relation to the imputation of Christ's righteousness. We have seen that Dwight also distinguishes roles within the divine act of imputation, yet not in the sense of a *legal union* between Christ and the believer. Overall, Dwight's notion of *union* contains a moralistic element. He characteristically speaks of *moral union* with Christ, and quite often of the act of faith connecting Christ's righteousness and the believer, yet not in the solidaric relationship between Christ, as the federal Head of his people, and believers.

In Dwight's understanding, faith precedes regeneration in the *ordo salutis*, while in Edwards's view God's foreknowledge precedes regeneration. Real differences do exist in the way Edwards and Dwight understand the work of the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation. Both of them would agree with each other that God links the righteousness of Christ to the believer. However, according to Dwight, but not according to Edwards, a person is able to receive the gift of salvation by the exercise of the will.³⁰⁹ And while Dwight would tend to exclude God's sovereign grace in the act of *union*, Edwards would exclude moral value of faith from the imputed righteousness of Christ. Edwards believes that the role of the Holy Spirit is legally to "make us one with Christ."³¹⁰ In any case, for Dwight, the act of faith can actually cause the Holy Spirit to establish the relationship between the righteousness of Christ and the believer. Eventually, Dwight departs from Edwards's synthetic view of justification, and forms his analytical view through his own doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

³⁰⁹ This finally drives Dwight to emphasize absolute human freedom in salvation.

C. Conclusion

We have explored the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Jonathan Edwards and Timothy Dwight, two figures who were important in the Great Awakening of eighteenth-century America. We have learned that the former stays in the line of the Reformers in the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, maintaining the idea of legal union between Christ and the believer, while the latter has a hard time connecting them, because he argues for moral union between the righteousness of Christ and the wicked, achieved through the act of faith.

Edwards's doctrine of justification is consistent as a system that sees the whole structure of salvation under the idea of *sola gratia*. For Edwards, God's free grace is the source of *legal* union with Christ and justification. There is much more to the doctrine of God's free grace, which is a major focus of Edwards's soteriology.

Edwards argues that there is a necessity for the atonement and the imputed righteousness of Christ due to the effects of original sin. When Edwards suggests that God's efficacious grace is the *strongest motive*, his intent is to explain how a person is powerless to earn God's righteousness. The doctrine of *forensic* justification is developed by Edwards to show how the unregenerate, totally depraved sinners, can earn the righteousness of Christ by grace alone. On this view, if a person is finally saved, then everything God does for him in the process of salvation is God's gift, for in every event God is preparing the way for the person's final salvation through the operation of the Holy Spirit. The *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness manifests God's gracious

³¹⁰ Hoekema rightly defines the role of the Holy Spirit in justification: "The chief role of the Holy Spirit in the process of our salvation is to make us one with Christ." Hoekema, *Saved by Grace*, 28-29.

work, with the Holy Spirit being the actual cause and human participation through faith being the instrumental cause in salvation.

It is not surprising that Edwards describes faith as the believer's uniting with Christ, for by faith alone Christ's righteousness becomes the believer's through *legal* union with Christ as the ground for *forensic* imputation. For Edwards, faith is the bond between Christ's righteousness and the believer. The wicked cannot be justified without God's saving grace, communicated by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Edwards maintains that by faith alone an *alien* righteousness is legally transferred to the wicked through union with Christ by the work of the Holy Spirit. Dealing with the *alien* righteousness of Christ, Edwards distinguishes himself from the Arminians by advocating a *synthetic* view of justification. Edwards makes it clear that the forensic doctrine of justification implies a close relation between *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*.

It is certainly true that Edwards is determined to defend the *forensic* justification of the Reformers in the sense of *sola fide–sola gratia*. Edwards warns that the *synergistic* view of human cooperation with God in salvation results from the misinterpretation of *sola fide–sola gratia* in justification, causing Arminians to eliminate the exclusiveness of divine grace in salvation. In his view of the federal headships of Adam and Christ, Edwards finally establishes a legal union between Christ and the believer through faith alone, turning us from human merit to *Christ's imputed merit alone through God's grace alone*. Edwards basically follows the Reformers in his doctrine of the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Unlike Edwards, Dwight propounds the idea of duty in the receiving of justification. Rather than encouraging sinful people to embrace God's grace in salvation,

Dwight encourages them to use the power that is already in their mind to take hold of God's righteousness. His emphasis on the inheritance of the corrupted nature of Adam from generation to generation in *biological* or *genetic* nature and the governmental theory of the atonement leads to a moralistic perspective on the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ. His main argument is in essence a plea for the importance of free will as moral ability and for the importance of the act of faith as moral union, not the importance of *legal union* with Christ.

For Dwight, the imputation of Christ's righteousness is not based on the legal union of the believer with Christ by faith alone. Rather, as he repeatedly insists, it is based upon the exercise of moral ability through moral union with Christ's righteousness. Dwight's argument on divine constitution is also contrary to Edwards's view. Dwight regards it as God's duty to impute the merit of Christ to those who freely exercise faith.

Dwight held to the mediate imputation of Christ's righteousness, but it is questionable whether that can truly link the believer to Christ's righteousness. That is, of course, the position of some New Divinity men, but it is by no means accepted by Edwards. There is no reason to believe that there is a contrary relationship between the effects of original sin and the efficacious grace of God in salvation. Dwight regards God's grace in salvation as an *open* opportunity to everyone to the act of faith. But he repudiates the *solidaric* relationship between Christ and the believer. This confusion is caused by the doctrine of the mediate imputation of Adam's sin through inherited depravity from generation to generation. Dwight simply denies the point of Edwards that humanity after the Fall is impotent to obtain God's favor in salvation. Dwight believes that God provides the opportunity of voluntary cooperation in salvation through the

power of free will. Why does God give favors to people? These favors are the overflow of God's grace as he sends Christ to save all sinners. Nevertheless, the divine declarations of the gospel must be *believed* by human beings as a part of their duty, for God's foreknowledge allows them absolute freedom in salvation.

Dwight compromises God's sovereign grace in favor of free will and the natural power of *certainty* in the soul. Dwight's discussion of God's grace in salvation, in my view, is somewhat confused because of ambiguities in the term. God's grace, for Dwight, does not refer to the *forensic* imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, but only to Christ's atonement. However, Edwards finds God's grace in *legal union* with Christ. Dwight does not give any reason to reject it, but his view rules out the possibility of God's sovereign determination in the matter of justification.

As for the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, Dwight fails to explain persuasively how the righteousness of Christ is connected with the believer through moral union. This leaves the doctrine of justification by faith alone through God's grace alone by Christ's righteousness alone dangerous and moralistic.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE IMPUTATION OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE KOREAN REVIVALS

A. The Influence of Calvinistic Revivals on the Korean Revivals

In this chapter, we will discuss the influence of Calvinistic revivals on the Korean revivals and then examine four famous revivalist preachers: Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Yong-Do Lee, and Sung-Bong Lee. In order to better understand the four Korean preachers who greatly influenced the Korean churches, it will be helpful to get an overall picture of the origin of Korean revivalism. To do this, we will trace the theological roots of the early Korean churches.

In most cases, American missionaries supplied the theology for the early Korean churches. Before these missionaries came to Korea in the late nineteenth century, America had experienced a transitional era of revivalism.

One of the most important influences on the American missionaries to Korea was Dwight L. Moody (1837-1899). Many of those missionaries were influenced by Moody's revival movement or his Student Volunteer Movement.¹ Moody was promoting new

¹ Yong-Kyu Park, *A History of Presbyterian Theological Thought in Korea* (Seoul: Chonshin Publishing Company, 1992), 48-49, 358; Yong-Kyu Park, *The Great Revivalism in Korea: Its History, Character, and Impact, 1901-1910* (Seoul: Word of Life, 2000), 20, 73; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelism, 1870-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 32; James H. Nicholas, *History of Christianity 1650-1950: Secularization of the West* (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1956), 436-38; Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the*

evangelicalism with an emphasis on “individual conversions.”² Unlike Finney, Moody did not desire to develop any form of theology, but presented the gospel in an “emotional powerful form” from an Arminian viewpoint.³ Sydney Ahlstrom’s argument is similar to Noll’s analysis:

Dwight Moody’s message was a simple and relatively innocuous blend of American optimism and evangelical Arminianism. Holding aloft his Bible, he assured his hearers that eternal life was theirs for the asking, that they had only to “come forward and t-a-k-e, TAKE!” This done, his follow-up instruction was short and to the point: “Join some church at once.”⁴

Moody’s approach had another interesting implication. He thought that *individual conversions* would eventually result in “social reform.”⁵ This conviction serves to explain his theological emphases in revivals. Furthermore, Moody’s Arminian revivalism, with his *pietistic* emphasis, was easily blended into the “American Calvinist tradition since the first

American People (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 809, 864; Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 290-91. Moody believed in the infallibility of the Bible and premillennialism. Marsden, 33, 37.

² Moody also offered a “new version of holiness doctrine which emphasized *victory* over sin.” Marsden, 37-38. Marsden calls Moody “a progenitor of fundamentalism.” *Ibid.*, 33. It should be noted that Marsden defines the fundamentalism of the 1920s as “militantly anti-modernist Protestant evangelicalism,” such as “evangelicalism, revivalism, pietism, the holiness movements, millenarianism, Reformed confessionalism, Baptist traditionalism, and other denominational orthodoxies.” Marsden, then, argues that today’s fundamentalists are “almost all millenarians” who believe in “Biblical inerrancy.” *Ibid.*, 4-5.

³ Noll, 289-90; Marsden, 32, 37. Noll asserts that Moody’s message can be summarized as the “Three R’s”: “Ruin by Sin, Redemption by Christ, and Regeneration by the Holy Ghost.” Noll, 289.

⁴ Ahlstrom, 745. David Bundy calls Moody a “Wesleyan/Holiness evangelist.” David Bundy, “Keswick and Evangelical Piety,” in *Modern Christian Revivals*, ed. Edith L. Blumhofer and Randall Balmer (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 124. However, it is interesting to see that Moody’s message was supported by some Calvinists, such as Horatius Bonar in Britain. Iain Murray, *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelism, 1750-1858* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), 402-405.

⁵ Marsden, 37.

Great Awakening.”⁶ Moody’s revivalism shows how the Arminian view of human ability can become “common” even in Reformed circles. This does not come about through the Arminian doctrine of salvation. Rather, it comes from *inconsistent* teachings on the doctrine of regeneration, a doctrine that “allows room” for the power of the will.⁷

We will now turn to the theology of the American missionaries to Korea, and see whether their teachings were inherited from American revivalism, and examine the relation between their theology and the early Korean churches in the late nineteenth century. In order to understand the theological background of the early Korean churches, it is important to know that there were two major parties among the American missionaries: the Presbyterians and the Methodists. The Rev. H. N. Underwood was sent to Korea as the first ordained Presbyterian missionary in 1885, and the Rev. Dr. Henry G. Appenzeller, a Methodist, also arrived in 1885.⁸

Then, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (PCUSA) and the Presbyterian Church in the United States sent missionaries for more than 30 years, starting with the year 1885. A great number of Presbyterian missionaries, following the Reformed tradition, regarded the

⁶ Marsden, 45-46; Bundy, 123-24.

⁷ Marsden, 46. Melvin Dieter shows that Moody confessed to having experienced a “second blessing,” which signifies holiness revival. Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Scarecrow Press, 1996), 253; Marsden, 78.

⁸ L. George Paik, *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea: 1832-1910* (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1970), 70-73, 107-17; The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, *A History of Korean Church, 16C-1918*, vol. 1 (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1989), 174-77. Underwood graduated from New Brunswick Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church in America, and Appenzeller from Drew Theological Seminary. Dr. H. N. Allen, a medical missionary (PCUSA), arrived in Korea in 1884. Paik, *History*, 97-99.

Westminster Confession of Faith as their doctrinal standard.⁹ Among those Presbyterian missionaries, McCormick Seminary graduates had a great influence on the Korean churches in the early twentieth century as the leaders of the *revival* movements and *theological* education, as Yong-Kyu Park points out:

Truly Princeton-trained missionaries did not take the lead in the missionary works in Korean Presbyterian churches for the first twenty five years; rather McCormick-trained ones did. Within several years after missionary works had started in Korea, Pyongyang became the center of evangelical works, and their works gave a crop of fruit quantitatively and qualitatively. *Not only revival movements but also theological education spread out from Pyongyang.* However, evangelical works and theological education [Union Theological Seminary at Pyongyang] were not led by Princeton-trained missionaries but by McCormick-trained ones.¹⁰

These missionaries played an important role in the early Korean Presbyterian churches.

Their theological points were essentially in agreement with conservative Calvinism: (1) the inerrancy of the Bible, (2) the virgin birth of Christ, (3) Christ's substitutionary atonement, (4) his bodily resurrection, and (5) the second coming of Christ.¹¹ Their contributions to the

⁹ They were conservative Calvinists. Park, *History*, 70-71. In the year 1909, for example, there were 40 PCUSA missionaries: 16 graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary, 11 from McCormick Theological Seminary, 4 from San Anselmo Theological Seminary, and 3 from Union Theological Seminary in New York. The rest of the missionaries graduated from Moody Bible Institute and the Biblical Seminary of New York. Harvie M. Conn, *Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church* (Seoul: Korea Society for Reformed Faith and Action, 1997), 13; Park, *History*, 65-67.

¹⁰ Park, *History*, 67 (italics added). Cf. Conn, *Studies*, 12-13. Both Princeton and McCormick Seminaries were conservative Reformed schools. Union Theological Seminary at Pyongyang was the first Presbyterian seminary in Korea, which was established in 1901. Park clearly shows that even in the year 1916, most of the professors at Union Seminary at Pyongyang were McCormick-trained missionaries: Samuel A. Moffet (president and professor), W. L. Swallon (professor of Christian ethics, and Old and New Testaments), Charles Allen Clark (professor of homiletics), Graham Lee, W. N. Blair, S. F. Moor, Cyril Ross, C. F. Berheisel, and J. E. Adams. Park, *History*, 65-68.

¹¹ Park, *History*, 70-71. This reminds us of the "famous five points" of the Presbyterian General Assembly in the 1910s and 1920s (PCUSA). However, missionaries did not emphasize the "authenticity of the miracles," but rather the premillennial second coming of Christ. Marsden, 117; Deok Kyo Oh, *A History of the Presbyterians* (Suwon: Hapdong Presbyterian Theological Seminary Press, 2000), 249-50; Park, *History*, 245-55.

emerging conservative Calvinism were large in the Korean churches, although challenged by liberalism and modernism in the 1930s. These missionaries were the founders of conservative Calvinism in Korea.¹² They firmly believed in the inerrancy of the Scripture and premillennialism. They were Calvinists, maintained that nothing should stand in the way of preaching the gospel and spreading orthodox Reformed teachings.

In the late nineteenth century, in the second major party of American missionaries, H. G. Appenzeller was one of the most influential Methodist missionaries. Appenzeller, a graduate of Drew Theological Seminary, was significantly influenced by John Wesley. Most leading Methodist missionaries also attended Drew.¹³ Wesleyan theology developed out of these early Methodist missionaries. Especially endorsed by Appenzeller, this Wesleyanism strongly influenced the early Korean churches.¹⁴ Thus, in pointing to the gospel as the first principle of missionary work, they drew on Christian living and ethics, for the Wesleyan tradition encouraged intellectual power and the practical and experiential aspects of religion.¹⁵ Their theology reflected not only pietism, but also Arminian

¹² Park, *History*, 62-135, 184-208, 210-41, 242-78; Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean Church and Reformed Faith: Focusing on the Historical Study of Preaching in the Korean Church* (Seattle, WA: Time Printing, 1996), 269-75. Harvie Conn notes that under the influence of these Reformed missionaries, the first Korean Presbyterian presbytery, which was formed in 1907, adapted the Calvinistic creed of the Indian Presbyterian Church. Conn, *Studies*, 17-20. Cf. The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, vol. 1, 285.

¹³ Most professors at the Union Biblical Institute (Union Methodist Theological Seminary in 1910), which was established in 1907, were Drew Seminary graduates, such as C. S. Deming (president), W. A. Noble, and W. C. Sweaer, including H. Welch, who led Methodist missions in Korea as a bishop from the year 1916. Allen D. Clark, *A History of the Church in Korea* (Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1971), 179-80; Deok-Joo Rhie, *A Study of the Formation of the Indigenous Church in Korea: 1903-1907* (Seoul: Hankukkidockyo Yonkuso, 2000), 61-62.

¹⁴ Rhie, 69; Park, *History*, 243-44.

¹⁵ Park, *Great*, 598; Rhie, *Study*, 55-56, 61-63.

theology.¹⁶ Many of the Methodist missionaries were regarded either as participants in the holiness movement or in Moody's revival movements, or as admirers of these movements.¹⁷

One of the most significant Methodist missionaries in Korean revivalism was Dr. Robert A. Hardie, a medical missionary.¹⁸ The Wonsan Revival Movement arose through the Wonsan prayer meeting and through the spiritual experience of Dr. Hardie in August 1903.¹⁹ Dr. Hardie's experience was regarded as similar to that of Evan Roberts, who ignited the Wales Revival Movement in 1904.²⁰ The more the Korean people grew familiar with the term "revival meeting," as they had during his revival meetings, the more they grew interested in revival meetings.²¹ Dr. Hardie's Arminian revivalism not only partly shaped the general viewpoint of Korean revivalism, but also helped the Korean churches have the Great Revival in 1907.²² Hardie promoted experiential religion through "prayer

¹⁶ Rhie, 56-57, 61-62. Thus, they had a more "aggressive" missionary policy, while Presbyterians were "conservative and cautious." Paik, *History*, 159.

¹⁷ Park, *Great*, 73.

¹⁸ Dr. Hardie also was president of the Biblical Training Institute of Korea. Chai-Yong Choo, *A History of Christian Theology in Korea* (Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1998), 91.

¹⁹ Park, *Great*, 39; Choo, 93. Dr. Hardie realized "his pride, hardness of heart, and lack of faith" and publicly confessed his sins. His confession greatly helped spread the great awakening. It continued to spread from Wonsan, thanks to the leading of Dr. Hardie. At the same time, F. Franson (the Scandinavian Missionary Alliance) challenged missionaries and Koreans through evangelistic meetings, and helped get the great awakening going. Park, *Great*, 39-88.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 45.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 69-88.

²² The Great Revival in 1907 was the first and most significant spiritual awakening in Korean church history, which fundamentally influenced Korean churches to promote revivalism. Its influence on the idea of revivalism still exists today. We will discuss it further.

and repentance,” which was widely accepted by many Wesleyan missionaries. The emphasis on prayer and repentance in Hardie’s preaching came from his conviction that “individual conversions” should occur through prayer in spiritual fellowship with God and the work of the Holy Spirit on the basis of “the word of God.”²³

In 1893, the famous Nevius method took shape as a policy for missionaries working in Korea.²⁴ During the following years, many missionaries followed the principles of the Nevius method to train Korean Christians. The Nevius method had a major impact on the Korean churches by emphasizing (1) self-support and (2) Bible study.²⁵ The Nevius method became the focus of missionary work in Korea. The focus on Bible study was successful not only in building up the Korea church, but also in protecting Christians from

²³ Hardie also believes that the Scripture is “the inspired and authoritative word of God” and is “the only standard of Christian life.” Choo, 92-93.

²⁴ The Nevius method came from Dr. Nevius’s book, *Planting and Development of Missionary Churches* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958). In 1890, Dr. and Mrs. Nevius visited Seoul for two weeks to discuss the principles of missionary works in Korea. As a result, the Nevius method was adopted by American missionaries. Clark, 114; Paik, *History*, 215; H. G. Underwood, *The Call of Korea* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company), 109; In-Soo Kim, *History of the Christian Church in Korea* (Seoul: Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, 1997), 192-94; Hae-Yon Kim, *Hankukkydockyohoesa* [A history of the Korean church] (Seoul: Sungji Publishing Company, 1999), 476-89.

²⁵ Some other main points of the Nevius method were: “self-propagating, self-governing, self-respecting, and self-relying Korean church.” Clark, 114-15; Paik, *History*, 215-16; Underwood, 109-10; Park, *History*, 110-20. However, its most significant contribution to the Korean church was the “Bible study system, which encouraged every Christian to study his Bible and to be able to pass on to others what he found there.” Clark, 115.

liberalism.²⁶ Missionary reports indicate that Bible studies following the Nevius method formed the basis of the Great Revival of 1907.²⁷

However, while the Calvinist missionaries disapproved of liberalism, modernism, and neo-orthodox theology, they tried to have friendships with the influential Methodist missionaries in hopes that they could cooperate to preach the gospel in Korea. This effort toward union was a crucial factor in the emergence of revivalism as an organized movement in Korea.²⁸ The union movement created a sense of unity among the missionaries in Korea. The creation of the General Council of Evangelical Mission in Korea by the Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries in 1905 was especially significant.²⁹

By 1905, a policy called the "Comity agreement" was established.³⁰ As a result of this policy to avoid theological debates between the two major American missionary groups, great enthusiasm to stay away from theological differences prevailed among the Korean

²⁶ Conn, *Studies*, 13-15; Park, *History*, 110-17. Park points out that the early American missionaries never introduced the liberal view of Scripture. In Korean church history, for example, *form criticism* was first introduced by a Methodist, Kyung-ock Chung, in 1934. Park, *History*, 166.

²⁷ Park, *History*, 113-35; Clark, 112-18, 166; Roy E. Shearer, *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966), 53-57, 128.

²⁸ Paik, *History*, 378-79; Kyung-Bae Min, *Hankuk Kidokkyohoesa* [A history of the Korean church] (Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1995), 286; Park, *History*, 57; Park, *Great*, 503.

²⁹ Clark, 168; Paik, *History*, 381-82; Park, *History*, 57; Park, *Great*, 130-33, 507-9. Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries eventually agreed to unite the Korean churches as one denomination, disregarding theological issues. However, a proposal to unite the Korean churches as one denomination was disapproved by Presbyterians and Methodists in America, who did not want to ignore the theological differences. Although "one united church" was not formed in Korea, due to American opposition, united effort in the mission field did not cease. Park, *Great*, 514-17; Paik, *History*, 378-79.

³⁰ In 1893, the Northern Presbyterian and Northern Methodist missions made an effort to reach a comity agreement in order to divide the Korean mission field, but it met with failure. Thus, the formal comity agreement was first adopted by Presbyterians and Methodists in 1905. It can be called "the division of territory." Clark, 112, 168-70; Paik, *History*, 201, 381-84; John T. Kim, *Protestant Church Growth in Korea* (Belleville, Ontario: Essence Publishing, 1996), 102-3.

Protestant churches until the liberation of Korea in 1945.³¹ This effort downplayed the theological issues between Calvinism and Arminianism, and that caused some theological confusion among Korean Christians. And when territory was divided between the Presbyterian and the Methodist missionaries, some churches had to exchange their theological beliefs for those of the other group, and that was also confusing.³² The Comity agreement and the union movement helped make Arminian revivalism a non-denominational movement in Korea. The Arminian view of revivalism was far more popular than the Reformed position and became well established in the early Korean revivalist tradition. As a result, Korean revivalism has tended to be more Arminian than Calvinistic.

The emphasis on unity and Arminian revivalism was common among American missionaries even in the Great Revival of 1907. The Presbyterian and the Methodist missionaries, for example, decided to gather together for special prayer meetings for revival at the end of 1906 and the beginning of 1907.³³ The practice of “praying aloud simultaneously,” which was borrowed from the Wales Revival movement, was first introduced by Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston in 1906.³⁴ In 1906, Sun-Ju Kil, one of the four

³¹ Clark, 168-70; Rhie, 76, 150-52; The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, vol. I, 209-13. There is no doubt that the efforts of Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries to work together rendered great service in the growth of the Korean churches.

³² Conn states that the missionaries did not abide by the comity agreement and often rearranged the territory of the mission field. Because of this agreement, Korean Presbyterians had to live with Methodist missionaries, and this exposed them to the “liberal theology” of Methodists. Conn, *Studies*, 65-66.

³³ Park, *Great*, 195-201; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 242-48.

³⁴ Park, *Great*, 195, 217.

famous Korean revivalists, received the “amazing grace of the Holy Spirit” in one of the united revival meetings held by the Presbyterians and the Methodists, in which Dr. Howard Johnston was a guest speaker.³⁵ The Great Revival first broke out during the Winter Bible Training Class for Men in Jangdaehyun Presbyterian Church at Pyongyang on January 14, 1907.³⁶

The Great Revival of 1907, with its Arminian spirit, set the pattern for future Korean revivalism. The Great Revival prompted most Korean churches to have revival meetings, characterized by prayer (often praying aloud simultaneously), repentance (confession of sins), witnessing, and singing.³⁷ Sun-Ju Kil (1869-1935) was greatly influenced by this revivalism and was used by God to bring revival to the Korean churches.³⁸ Kil stressed prayer, repentance, and confession of sins in his revival meetings.³⁹

³⁵ Kil's experience took place in Jangdaehyun Presbyterian Church at Pyongyang in October 1906. Park, *Great*, 187.

³⁶ On that day, about 2000 people from 400 Korean Presbyterian churches were gathered together in Jangdaehyun Presbyterian Church at Pyongyang. They held Bible study classes and prayer meetings, and conducted street evangelism and special evening evangelistic meetings. Park, *Great*, 207-15; Hae-Yon Kim, 156-65.

³⁷ Clark, 159-65; Park, *Great*, 216-21, 250, 287, 309, 316-18, 322, 329, 333, 452, 456-63. These elements, as we have seen, are similar to those found in Finney's *social religious meeting*. Thus, American missionaries may have adopted them from Finney. They may also have been influenced by the method of Finney's new measures, since they held revival meetings over a period of several days. Cf. Murray, *Revival*, 242-43, 283; Oh, *History*, 233-34; “Charles Finney,” in *Oxford Dictionary*, 612-13; Marsden, 45. Also, the Million Movement helped spread the spirit of revival during 1909 and 1910. Clark, 170-72; Paik, *History*, 384-87; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 263; The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, vol. 1, 276-82.

³⁸ It is said that Kil received the baptism of the Holy Spirit in a revival meeting at Pyongyang in 1906 and experienced the Great Revival in 1907. Park, *Great*, 301.

³⁹ Sun-Ju Kil, *Kil Sun-Ju Mocksasulkyo: Kangdaebogam* [Sermons] (Seoul: Hyemunsa, 1969), 2-3, 6-9, 25, 53, 59, 70-71, 72, 82-83, 85, 100, 104, 116, 121, 128-29, 131-32, 137-38, 143, 146, 163, 192, 195-96, 203, 220-21; Sun-Ju Kil, *Kil Sun-Ju Mocksasulkyo: Daniel Sakyungan* [Sermons] (Seoul: Hyemunsa, 1969), 35, 42, 77, 88, 95-96, 99-100, 102-3, 114, 121, 123, 126-27, 160, 168-73. Cf. Sung-Kuh Chung, *A History of Preaching in Korea* (Seoul: Presbyterian General Assembly Theological Seminary Press, 1986), 137, 140,

In this respect, Kil played an important role in the Great Revival in 1907, like Evan Roberts in the Wales Revival in 1904.⁴⁰

Meanwhile, Ik-Doo Kim (1874-1950), another famous revivalist, was deeply moved by God's grace in one of Kil's revival meetings in 1906.⁴¹ Kim took over the approach of Sun-Ju Kil, and added prayer for healing to revivalism.⁴² Kim stressed "prayer, repentance, and healing" in his teachings.⁴³ Kyung-Bae Min suggests that Kim's revival

144; Park, *Great*, 231, 235, 241, 294-301; Oh, *History*, 281-82; Dong-Sick Yoo, *Hankukshinhackui Kwangmack* [The vein of Korean theology] (Seoul: Dasan Kulbang, 2000), 70. It is surprising for Kil to say that he liked the fourfold gospel of the Holiness Church: healing, the second coming of Christ, regeneration, and holiness. Kil, *Daniel*, 64. This teaching sharply conflicts with Calvinistic traditions.

⁴⁰ Park, *Great*, 230-31; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 249-54.

⁴¹ In-Seo Kim describes Kil's influence on Kim. In-Seo Kim, "Youngge Sunsangsojun [A biographical sketch of Rev. Sun-Ju Kil]," in Kil, *Daniel*, 214. Before that occasion, Kim was converted by the sermon of W. L. Swallon, "Eternal Life," in 1900. Kyung-Bae Min, *Iljehai Hankuk Kidokkyo Minjock Shinangwundongsa* [The history of the Korean Christian nationalism and faith movement under Japanese rule] (Seoul: Daehan Kicokk Seuhoi, 1991), 293; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 422; Park, *Great*, 157, 279-80; Yoo, *Hankukshinhackui*, 69.

Both Kil and Kim graduated from Union Theological Seminary at Pyongyang, which was established by Presbyterian missionaries. Since Kim was a student at Union Seminary during 1906, he must have been influenced by revival meetings or prayer meetings. In April 1907, professors and students at Union Seminary experienced the "grace of the Holy Spirit" in special prayer meetings for a week. It is said that students repented deeply and were greatly changed by the work of the Holy Spirit. Both Kil and Kim must have participated in these prayer meetings. Park, *Great*, 279-86, 363.

⁴² Kim's sermon, "Religion of Prayer," and a book called *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles] are filled with the theme of prayer. *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles] tries to prove that miraculous works occurred in Kim's revival meetings and stresses the power of prayer for healing. Ik-Doo Kim, *Kim Ik-Doo Mocksa Sulkyo* [The sermons of Rev. Ik-Doo Kim] (Seoul: Hyemunsa, 1969), 9-19; *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles], ed. Rev. Taek-Kwon Im (Seoul: Yasochoseowon, 1921). "Repent, the Kingdom of God Is at Hand" is one of his sermons that stress repentance. Ik-Doo Kim, *Kim Ik-Doo Mocksa Sulkyo*, 112-14. Such emphasis on prayer and repentance can be found in his other sermons. *Ibid.*, 4, 27, 45, 50, 54, 67, 79, 84, 94, 96-97, 107-9.

⁴³ Chun-Kun Han, *Chuckjiannun Soenkyoja Kim Ik-Doo* [A never-dying martyr, Ik-Doo Kim] (Seoul: Sungseo Shinhackseowon, 1995), 106-43; Yong-Kyu Park, *Ik-Doo Kim Mocksa Junki* [The biography of the Rev. Ik-Doo Kim] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1998), 60; Byung-Hack Oh, *Ik-Doo Kim* (Seoul: Kyujang, 1995), 67; Min, *Iljehai*, 279-80, 288, 297, 300, 303, 314, 317, 332; Park, *Great*, 355-56; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 156-57, 162; Min, *Iljehai*, 288-90, 291-310, 311-16. Kim often mentions D. L. Moody in his sermons. Ik-Doo Kim, *Kim Ik-Doo Mocksa Sulkyo*, 48-49, 52.

meetings were characterized by prayer, Bible study, repentance, and witnessing.⁴⁴ His revival meetings reflected the pattern of prayer meetings and revival meetings in 1906 and 1907.

Yong-Do Lee (1901-1933), a Methodist revivalist, also inherited the spirit of the Great Revival of 1907, for he endorsed the idea of Arminian revivalism that revivals must be accompanied by repentance.⁴⁵ As for prayer, Lee teaches that it always goes hand in hand with repentance and is a duty for every Christian.⁴⁶ As a matter of fact, Lee firmly believes in the religion of experience, which demonstrates a new Arminian revivalism, even

⁴⁴ Min, *Iljehai*, 305-11.

⁴⁵ Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki* [The diaries of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee], vol. 3 (Seoul: Simuwon, 1953), 29-31; Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Shinhack* [The theology of faith of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee], vol. 6 (Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986), 120. Unlike the days of Kil and Kim in the early twentieth century, the term “revival” had already become common among Korean Christians. There is no clear evidence that Lee was directly influenced by those two predecessors or participated in their revival meetings. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksachun* [The biography of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee], (Seoul: Shinsaengkwan, 1973), 1-24. His stress on repentance is abundant in his teachings. Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 15, 37, 44, 65 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 3, 15, 63, 92-93; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Samoohshipyon* [Admiration for the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for a half century], vol. 7 (Seoul: Sungkwang Munwhasa, 1981), 60; Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Seoganjip* [The letters of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee] (Seoul: Sungkwang Munwhasa, 1982), 35, 41, 104, 232; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Shinhack*, 22-23, 114; Jong-Ho Byun, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Yeonkoo Banseki* [The study of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for half a century], vol. 8 (Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986), 102-3, 196, 239.

⁴⁶ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 11 [Appendix II]. He also believes that Christian life must include “repentance, prayer, thanksgiving, love, and sacrifice.” Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 33. He seems to assume that Lee acknowledges the characteristics of revivalism, since Lee and his friends as students at Union Methodist Theological Seminary (later Korean Methodist Theological Seminary) decided to pray for revival meetings when they were invited to lead revival meetings. Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 15. Lee does teach the importance of prayer. Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 11, 43 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 65; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Samoohshipyon*, 58, 68-69, 83, 107, 313, 315; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Seogangip*, 29, 41, 53, 69, 90, 95, 103, 113, 115, 126-29, 174-76, 197, 217, 260-61; Jong-Ho Byun, ed., *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Yeonkoo Sashipyon* [The study of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for forty years], vol. 4 (Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986), 129-32, 144-45; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Shinhack*, 22-23, 41, 48, 91-95, 96-97; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 220; Kyung-Bae Min, *Iljehai*, 342-45, 367; Dong-Sick Yoo, *Hankukshinhackui*, 163; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 430.

stronger than the Wesleyan traditions.⁴⁷ More seriously, his growing emphasis on mystical experience drew severe criticism in the Korean Methodist Church, for his theology pushed even Wesleyan theology in a new direction.⁴⁸

The fourth revivalist, Sung-Bong Lee (1900-1965), was an advocate of holiness revival.⁴⁹ As a descendant of Wesleyanism, he was indirectly connected with Arminian revivalism in the Great Revival of 1907.⁵⁰ However, there can be no doubt that the

⁴⁷ Lee Yong-Do Shinang and Sasang Yeonkuhoe [Lee Yong-Do Faith and Thought Studies], ed., *Lee Yong-Do Mocksaui Youngsungkwa Yesooundong* [Spirituality of the Jesus movement of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee] (Seoul: Sungeo Yonkusa, 1998), 26, 121-22, 145, 212, 233, 195; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae, Shinhack, Yongsung* [The life, theology, and spirituality of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee] (Seoul: Handl Publishing Co., 2001), 38, 111, 155, 157, 167, 232, 236; Min, *Iljehai*, 383, 391; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 190, 196, 201, 203, 206.

⁴⁸ Due to his mysticism, Lee was not only suspended from his office but also excommunicated from Korean Methodist Church in December 1932. However, the Korean Methodist Church unanimously decided in March 1999 to reinstate Lee in his former position. As a result, many Methodist scholars these days are studying Lee's theology. *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 89.

⁴⁹ To Lee, of great importance is the fourfold gospel of the Holiness Church: regeneration, holiness, healing, and the second coming of Christ. Sung-Bong Lee, *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 1: Autobiography Mallo Mothamyun Juckummuro* [With death if not possible with words] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993), 100; Sung-Bong Lee, *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 2: Sarangui Kangdan* [Sermons: love pulpit] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993), 61-66; *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 3: Immanuel Kangdan* [Sermons: Immanuel pulpit] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993), 60-88; Sung-Bong Lee, *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 4: Buhungui Bigyul* [Sermons: the secrets of revivals] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993), 37-50. In 1927, Sung-Bong Lee graduated from the Biblical Institute (later Seoul Theological Seminary), which was established by Sang-Jun Kim and Bin Jung of the Oriental Missionary Society (later the Korean Holiness Church) in 1911. In 1904, the Oriental Missionary Society was first organized in Tokyo, Japan, by two ordained Methodist missionaries, C. E. Cowman and E. A. Kilbourne, who decided to become missionaries in missionary meetings at Moody Memorial Church of Chicago in 1894 and graduated from Moody Bible Institute. Both Kim and Jung studied at the Biblical Institute in Tokyo, which was also established by Cowman and Kilbourne. Cowman and Kilbourne helped them to establish the Biblical Institute in Korea. Sung-Bong Lee, 1:38-41; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 362-63; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 163; Min, *Hankukkydockkyohoesa*, 159. Sung-Bong Lee states that the major emphasis of the Biblical Institute was "thorough repentance." He recognized the value of repentance in the revival meetings of the Biblical Institute. Sung-Bong Lee, 1:38-39; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 164.

⁵⁰ Perhaps Lee can be called a pure heir of Moody's Arminian revivalism, since the Biblical Institute inherited the spirit of Moody's revivalism through Cowman and Kilbourne. Lee resolved to be a great revivalist like Rev. Ik-Doo Kim, whom he greatly respected and was influenced by, as he attended Kyungshin Elementary School, which was administered by Kim. In this respect, one can also say that Lee tended to side with Kim's revivalism. Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 163.

revivalism of Lee involved a genuine concern for prayer and repentance, following the Wesleyan tradition.⁵¹ Lee's revivalism, shown in the Arminian ideas of "prayer and repentance," was marvelously well suited to the prevailing theological atmosphere of the Korean churches in the twentieth century.⁵² This was not accidental, since Arminian revivalism took shape in the early twentieth century, and most Korean revivalists followed in that tradition.

To sum up, by opposing a Calvinistic approach to salvation under the influence of the Arminian revivalism of the late nineteenth century, many American Christians tended to be Arminian, and eventually became premillennialists.⁵³ Having been influenced by them, most American missionaries to Korea, including Presbyterians, were inclined to favor an Arminian revivalism that developed from the eighteenth-century awakenings in America and in which pietism mixed with dispensationalism and Reformed theology.⁵⁴ Moody's revival movement had a great influence on Presbyterian and the Methodist missionaries, and sparked off an Arminian revivalism in Korea.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:30, 82-90, 128, 200; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:19, 34, 36, 55-59, 60, 74, 84, 88, 115, 119, 167, 170; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:88-89, 90-91, 92-93, 94; Sung-Bong Lee, *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 5: Chunro Yeukjung Kangdan* [Sermons: love pulpit] (Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993), 184. He claims as well that repentance is significant. Sung-Bong Lee, 1:32-33, 39, 73, 74-76, 81, 89; 2:75, 49, 84, 95, 124, 140, 172; 3:18, 26, 30-31, 37, 44-49, 89, 99, 104, 110, 117, 156, 165; 4:121-22, 181; 5:17, 31, 33, 42, 51, 124, 169, 190, 194.

⁵² This includes his three predecessors: Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, and Yong-Do Lee.

⁵³ Marsden, 43-93; Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 32-33.

⁵⁴ Marsden, 32-93; Park, *History*, 68, 246-47.

⁵⁵ Park, *Great*, 73, 347-54, 599; Min-Yong Kim, *A History of the Korean Church* (Seoul: Korea Society for Reformed Faith and Action, 2001), 147; Park, *History*, 258.

Strikingly, not only avoiding the theological differences but also tolerating the Arminian revivalism, the Presbyterian Calvinist missionaries were willing to cooperate with the Methodist missionaries for revival movements in Korea.⁵⁶ Almost every denomination avoided any theological debate that might disrupt the unity of the early Korean churches, as American missionaries were reluctant to struggle with their theological differences.

Hence there was a strong union movement on the part of Presbyterian and the Methodist missionaries, and this provided an impulse for revival in Korea. This also provided an atmosphere of theological compromise without resistance, which enabled Arminian revivalism to penetrate the Korean churches, and before long revival meetings were popular in Korea. The active cooperation of the American missionaries was particularly important in shaping a distinctive revivalism in Korea. This Arminian revivalism characterized the revivalism of most Korean revivalists, including Sun-Ju Kil, Ik-Doo Kim, Yong-Do Lee, and Sung-Bong Lee. In hardly any major Korean denomination could a Calvinistic view of revivalism be found.

Before discussing Sun-Ju Kil's doctrine of justification, it should be noted that there were four major revivalist periods in Korea, each led by a famous preacher: (1) Sun-Ju Kil (a Presbyterian pastor, 1869-1935), (2) Ik-Doo Kim (a Presbyterian pastor, 1874-1950), (3) Yong-Do Lee (a Methodist pastor, 1901-1933), and (4) Sung-Bong Lee (a

⁵⁶ Conn suspects whether Calvinist missionaries clearly emphasized the importance of Calvinism. He also points out that the early Korean churches had no strong theological background and were busy to plant the seed of the gospel, raising the disciples of the Lord. Conn, *Studies*, 38; Clark, *History*, 118-29. Chung insists that "the study of Calvin" did not start before 1934 by Korean scholars. Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean*, 275.

Holiness pastor, 1900-1965).⁵⁷ During the first period of Korean revival, Sun-Ju Kil was the greatest preacher and evangelist in the country. Due to his preaching and teaching, the Great Revival of 1907 had a significant impact on the Korean church.

⁵⁷ Park, *Great*, 289-345; Min, *Iljehui*, 279-80; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 136-208; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 243-83, 421-30. Dong-Shick Yoo calls Sun-Ju Kil the “father of Korean Presbyterian church.” Dong-Shick Yoo, *Hankukshinhackui*, 69.

B. Sun-Ju Kil (1869-1935)

In understanding Kil's theology, the most important subject must be his doctrine of justification. Justification is inseparable from the question of human nature and the human condition. One must see how justification is possible, in light of human nature. We will examine the views of Kil on the necessity of justification for the wicked.⁵⁸

1. The Justification of the Wicked

When preaching the gospel, Kil does no more than repeat his emphasis on repentance and regeneration,⁵⁹ as in his sermon "A Prompt Salvation," where he states, "Rebuking the other criminal, 'We are punished justly, for we are getting what our deeds deserve,' the thief must recognize his sins. We can easily know that he was willing to repent."⁶⁰ However, according to Sung-Kuh Chung, Kil "raises his voice when he emphasizes the independence of the country and repentance. And he emphasizes the world

⁵⁸ For most citations from primary sources, I have used the best available published sources. All the English translations are my own translations. With regard to the purpose of this study, much of the discussion for the four Korean revivalists has focused on the direct use of the primary sources in their sermons or works. However, my research (other studies in Korea) has shown that sometimes there are not enough primary sources for the detailed discussion in their theology (especially Ik-Doo Kim).

For all the four Korean revivalists, we will first explore *the justification of the wicked* (the first section) in relation to original sin, God's grace, free will, faith, and the necessity of Christ's righteousness. Secondly, we will see their doctrine of *the imputation of Christ's righteousness* (the second section) in conjunction with forensic justification, election, legal union, and the imputation of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness.

⁵⁹ Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 144; The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, *A History of Korean Church: 1919-1945*, vol. II (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1990), 270; Oh, *History*, 282; Rhie, *Study*, 165-66; Soong-Hong Han, *Hankuk Sinhacksasangui Heureum* [The stream of Korean theological thought] (Seoul: Korea Presbyterian Theological College Press, 1996), 100.

⁶⁰ Kil, *Daniel*, 99. Kil mentions five elements of salvation in this sermon: repentance, faith, testimony, hope, and prayer. *Ibid.*, 99-103.

to come as a great master of eschatology.”⁶¹ Indeed, in his latter period, Kil is more interested in eschatology than in repentance and regeneration.⁶² Compared to the fullness of his arguments on eschatology, Kil’s statements on justification are surprisingly rare. When he elucidates the steps of redemption, justification is surely on the list, but he does not spend more than a few lines explaining it, and he never touches it again in the remainder of his sermons. There are very few sermons that contain significant references to the subject. As far as systematic treatment of justification is concerned, there are only a few sermons that are devoted to justification.⁶³

What is more surprising than the rarity of its mention is that Kil makes hardly any effort to relate the theme of justification to his thoughts on regeneration. His statements on justification stand on their own, without being linked to a systematic whole. What, then, is the relation between faith and justification? How is God’s grace imputed at regeneration in justification?

To begin effectively, one must answer these questions, one way or another. From the Reformers’ point of view, a person is justified *by faith alone* because one is justified by the unmerited righteousness of Christ alone. That assumes men are lost and powerless because of original sin. But Kil has a different doctrine of man:

⁶¹ Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 143. After 1919, when Kil got out of the prison under Japanese rule, the main theme of his sermons changed from the love of God to the last days. Min, *Hankukkidokkyohesa*, 396; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 421; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 151-52; The Institutes of Korean Church Histories, 1:189.

⁶² See Jin-Kyung Kil, *Younggye Kil Sun-Ju Moksa Yoogo Sunjip* [Collected posthumous works of Sun-Ju Kil] (Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1968).

⁶³ Kil, “The Gospel,” *Kangdaebogam*, 150-51; Kil, “The Justified by Faith,” *ibid.*, 182; Kil, “The Truth of New Salvation,” *ibid.*, 182-83; Kil, “Prompt Salvation,” *Daniel*, 99-103.

God gave man ability and the power of freedom, just like the absolute freedom of God, when God created man for the first time. To man, this is a great power and glory of personality with incredible freedom as important as life to him.... It is impossible to regard him either as a human being or a living creature without freedom Nothing can please God better than honoring Him with faith and trusting in Him with free will. The faith of Abraham not only becomes a model for all mankind, but also is called righteous, because he believed God with this freedom.⁶⁴

Here we see a concern for the power of freedom, which gives the soul “ability to please God.” This allows Kil to employ several different ideas in speaking of the soul that are not contradictory nor entirely consistent with one another in the doctrine of justification. For example, Kil tends to look at the relation between Adam and his children with his view of the *active* power of free will. In Kil’s anthropology, there is no trace of a close bond between Adam and the whole human race. But that kind of analysis needs supplementary discussion.⁶⁵

It is important to note that when Kil discusses the subject of human nature, he never speaks of distinctive faculties, as though one or more of them has some *active* capacity to receive the gift of God’s grace. In his sermon “Seven Words of Christ on the Cross (2),” Kil regards justification as the result of an act of faith, in an unclear explanation of the conversion of the thief. “In order to be saved, as the thief believed the Savior of Righteousness, so Christ counted him as a righteous person. Who can call him a thief? Who can say that his faith and testimony is less than the gospel of Paul—justification by

⁶⁴ See Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 126-27. See also *ibid.*, 132.

⁶⁵ We will discuss the relation between Adam and his posterity in the next section. Cf. Kil, *Daniel*, 121.

faith alone, less than Paul's testimony?"⁶⁶ That statement gives no more than a description of the *active* power of free will in soteriology, which is inconsistent with the teaching of the Reformers that God's grace precedes justification. There is also one passage in this sermon that touches on the relation of justification to grace. Kil offers the "five conditions of faith" to receive divine grace through the example of the thief in Luke 23:39-43.⁶⁷ "The first step to be saved, needless to say, is to repent."⁶⁸ In that sense, repentance initiates faith, and this faith brings forth justification. Does faith, then, play the role of a necessary condition in the doctrine of justification?

To Kil, it is impossible to speak of humanity counted righteous or unrighteous without being capable of consenting to the gospel. Does this mean, then, that men are free to choose God's grace? As Kil notes in his more moderate arguments, unbelievers need "only to believe what Jesus Christ has done for us through His sacrifice and what He taught us."⁶⁹ However, there is a certain complication here: Kil's words often reflect both God's grace and human responsibility in justification at the same time. When Kil says that God gives Christ by grace, he is speaking of an *open door* for salvation to "everyone."⁷⁰ But Kil is at the same time speaking of "human inability to overcome sin, and to do righteousness,"

⁶⁶ Kil, *Daniel*, 125.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 122; *ibid.*, 122-27.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 123.

⁶⁹ Kil, "Christ Given by Grace," *Kangdaebogam*, 102.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 101-2.

for the wicked have lost “spiritual power” after the Fall.⁷¹ Men after the Fall have no power to obtain righteousness before God. Thus, it would be wrong to think that his statements in no way express total depravity.⁷² More specifically, grace as “God’s gift” in Kil’s soteriology is “obtained without human works and without human merits.”⁷³ As Kil himself says:

But the thief believed Him. He never heard of the truth before. Nevertheless, he believed. He believed Jesus Christ, who was cursed and was about to die, as the Son of God. After being out of the prison, I met a friend of mine at a welcoming party. He was a county headman, who told me “All the Koreans will believe the Lord if your eyesight is fully recovered.” “Faith does not come from miracle, but from the work of the Holy Spirit,” I replied.... Oh, faith! Faith is not a product of miracle, but a gift of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁴

It seems that Kil does make God’s grace necessary in salvation. “The effects of faith,” he asserts, are “forgiveness, justification, redemption, and eternal life.”⁷⁵ Kil clearly states that the foundation of faith is “God’s gift.”⁷⁶ At the same time, nevertheless, he insists on an element of human response to that grace. The emphasis on God’s initiative and the primacy of grace seems equally strong in Kil’s theology. For example, in “Seven Words

⁷¹ Kil, *Daniel*, 187; Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 97.

⁷² Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 147; Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean*, 46.

⁷³ Kil, *Daniel*, 159. Among fifteen graces, for Kil there is “a grace to be justified (Rom. 5:10).” Ibid., 160. Kil in this sermon, “A Dish of Grace,” does not clearly differentiate God’s grace in justification from other graces. Ibid., 159-61.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 100.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 46.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

of the Lord on the Cross (1),” it is made clear that God is to be loved because “God showed us His great love on the cross”:

The first word of seven words on the cross, “Father, forgive them,” shows the great love of God in shedding the blood of Christ. This first word on the cross in Luke 23:34 reveals the infinite love of God, which for the first time rang out with his voice since the creation of the universe and man. No one can explain the love of God, because its magnitude and height are infinite.⁷⁷

A similar emphasis is found in his sermon “A Dish of Grace.” Kil clearly declares that grace comes from “God” alone.⁷⁸ Speaking of grace as God’s gift, Kil asks a question on the Pauline passages in relation to grace, “What is grace?”⁷⁹ He notes that a person can receive God’s grace without meritorious works because it is God’s gift.⁸⁰ However, he goes on to ask, “How can you receive grace?”⁸¹ Kil describes several phases to receiving God’s favor, such as “to realize sins, to be humbled, to love God, and to pray.”⁸² Kil’s statement also makes justification the result of God’s grace.⁸³ His teaching on the grace of God appears consistently in his sermons.⁸⁴ He does not hesitate to argue both that God wants

⁷⁷ Ibid., 118.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 159.

⁷⁹ Ibid. Kil uses Rom. 4:4-6, Rom. 11:6, and Eph. 2:8 to support his view.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid., 160.

⁸² Ibid. Kil does not draw a clear line between a saving grace and a sanctifying grace in his list of graces. As Kil shows how a person receives grace, he answers the question without clarifying the list. Thus, one must be careful when Kil uses the term “grace.”

⁸³ Kil even talks about the time when one receives grace: before the beginning of time (1 Tim. 1:9), from birth (Gal. 1:15), at the laying on of hands (1 Tim. 4:14), upon occasion (Heb. 4:16), and now (2 Cor. 6:2). Ibid. Kil again does not clarify the meaning of “grace.”

⁸⁴ See Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 39, 104, 139, 201, 209, 213, 214.

everyone to be saved by the exercise of their free will and that a person is saved by grace.

So what is effected by this grace? As Kil puts it in his sermon "Christ Given by Grace," he speaks of the sacrifice of Christ in relation to grace:

If delayed even for a single moment, never will he [an operator of an iron bridge] be able to save the life of his beloved son. So many lives in the train will be drowned at one time if he saves his beloved son [who was in the water]. At this time, he finally abandoned his son and quickly closed the iron bridge to save hundreds of people, and the train could safely manage to pass the bridge. Finally, his beloved son was sacrificed, and hundreds of lives were saved.⁸⁵

Clearly, Kil believes that God sacrificed his only begotten son to save all mankind. In other words, grace gives human beings Christ to be the vicarious sacrifice in salvation. Kil reflects on the necessity of righteousness in conjunction with the sins of human beings: "As all mankind make a dash at the track of sins, their faces show the fear of justice, and the bottom of their hearts demand *righteousness*."⁸⁶ This is a passage in which Kil says that Christ's righteousness is necessary in justification. Kil is emphatic that the grace of justification comes to human beings through the cross of Christ. By describing the righteousness of the law in Matthew 5:17, "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them," as "the law of Christ's kingdom," Kil evidently wants to elaborate on the satisfaction of divine justice in justification.⁸⁷ The argument first seeks to establish that a person "cannot be justified by the

⁸⁵ Ibid., 101.

⁸⁶ Kil, *Daniel*, 29 (italics added).

⁸⁷ Ibid.

law, but only through the cross of Christ.”⁸⁸ In “Three Blessings for Those Who Are in Jesus Christ,” he states:

For Christians, there is no condemnation—a passive aspect of divergence from death—but an active aspect, that is, attainment at the satisfaction of righteousness. As I allegorically compared it to a train, if I repeat that allegory again here, it is not only an empty train of divergence from death, but also a train of full justice, which runs on the rail of life.... There is no righteousness apart from God. If you run on the track of flesh, there is no righteousness. Now, God gives righteousness to a person who is in Jesus Christ, and will finally succeed in the completeness (fullness) of righteousness for us who run on the track of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁹

Although Kil does not conceive of the relationship between Christ and the believer in quite the same way as Calvin, he develops his understanding of what justification is along similar lines. As we have seen, he does endorse the grace of God in salvation, when it is related to the cross of Christ.

However, Kil also defines grace in many other ways. The most important of these in relation to justification is the grace of the beloved Son involved in justification through the act of faith. In his sermon “The Righteous by Faith,” Kil lays out what for him is a fundamental point: that justification is “by faith in Christ alone.”⁹⁰ Thus, he speaks of faith in Christ alone. He seems to understand justification as totally the work of God. Nevertheless, it is questionable whether the universality of the gospel offer in Kil clearly reflects God’s sovereign grace in salvation. That is, Kil’s doctrine of grace is by no means generally accepted in Reformed theology.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 182.

In his next sermon, “The New Truth of Salvation,” Kil proceeds to elucidate the doctrine of righteousness, which he regards as the way of salvation. Kil believes that “salvation is earned by the impartation of Christ’s merits and God’s righteousness” in justification, so that the sinner can have a share in Christ’s merits.⁹¹ Kil insists that the “purpose” of this new truth is to make man just like God.⁹² But can we really say with confidence that God shows his righteousness through Christ in order for God to make man just like him? Is Kil sure that the righteousness of Christ is not only imputed to the believer but also actually changes the essence of human beings?

An argument could be made for saying that “there is no distinction” between human beings, for everyone “can believe the truth.”⁹³ And he states that there are people who have “lost the righteousness of God” due to their sins.⁹⁴ Unfortunately, Kil is unclear on this point, which seems to depart from standard Reformed doctrine.

When Kil concludes his discussion of the conversion of the thief on the cross in his sermon “A Prompt Salvation,” he refers to “the law of faith”: “Legally speaking, the thief was executed by the law of the world, but he died as a *righteous* person by *the law of faith*. A little while ago, he was a thief, but a little later he was a *righteous* person who was authenticated by the Lord.”⁹⁵ Kil is clear in his insistence that man can be justified by faith.

⁹¹ Ibid., 182-83. Unfortunately, Kil does not develop the doctrine of imputation in justification further in these two sermons.

⁹² Ibid., 183.

⁹³ Ibid. This is Kil’s interpretation of Rom. 3:22-23.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Kil, *Daniel*, 103 (italics added).

Faith for him is “accomplished” from start to finish “by the law of faith.”⁹⁶ Are there any necessary ingredients of saving faith?

At this point, Kil presents us with an actual phase of redemption (based on Revelation 3:20): “Open the door! Open the door! Open the door and welcome Him.”⁹⁷ Kil goes on to say, in his next sermon, “A Strange Intercession,” that “Christ intercedes for the weak and the wicked” to open their hearts.⁹⁸ For him, “Open the door” is important. When Kil emphasizes human activity, he is adopting a *synergistic* point of view, for the Lord will shut the door of heaven if a person does not open the door of his heart and does not welcome him.⁹⁹ In this connection, it is necessary to call attention to the connection between the doctrine of man and the act of faith, which Kil’s definition of *self* mentions. In his sermon “The Vast Universe and One Individual Self,” Kil is confident that “I am the one who will save myself (by faith).”¹⁰⁰ For, in his view, a person “must improve his lot by himself.”¹⁰¹ This is indeed a powerful expression. As discussed earlier, Kil is right about the hopelessness of the wicked and the necessity of Christ’s sacrifice for the wicked. Nevertheless, Kil goes too far when he describes this act of faith in justification.

⁹⁶ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 151.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

Kil speaks of the believer as a “person who knows the Lord Jesus Christ and obeys the commands of God.”¹⁰² In other words, a saving faith for Kil is a saving knowledge of God that corresponds to the act of faith:

“Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life.” Know the Lord of eternal life. You come to Jesus Christ by *faith* and *knowledge* and live eternal life in Christ, for the passage of John 6:29 says that “we believe and know that you are the Holy One of God.”... Come to the Lord of eternal life and receive the eternal life!¹⁰³

We see in Kil’s treatment of faith here the same stress on human will rather than God’s will that we have seen before in his anthropology. Kil is emphatic that eternal life is given to us through the knowledge of God and Christ. Thus, everyone can come to Jesus Christ through *faith* and *knowledge*. This is similar to the conclusion we reached in regard to Kil’s notion of freedom: that it is an *active* power of the will, an exercise of *freedom*, which can be seen through the act of faith in conversion.

Another important idea to note here is the *source* of faith. We saw that Kil, after describing the faith of the thief as a saving faith, went on to say, “The thief believed the Savior of Righteousness.”¹⁰⁴ Whence comes this conviction? Kil’s answer is not precisely the same as Calvin’s. Kil, in his sermon on “The Holy Spirit,” presupposes that a person

¹⁰² Ibid., 54-56.

¹⁰³ Kil, *Daniel*, 156 (italics added). In the list of faith, Kil includes “to believe His name (John 1:12), to believe the performance of miraculous signs, and to believe the word (John 6:68-69).” And the list of knowledge [to know Christ by faith] involves “to perceive the Redeemer who saves us from our sins and from death (Acts 4:12), to perceive the Lord of grace and truth (John 1:14), and to perceive the Lord of life (John 17:3).” Ibid., 156. Kil also defines *life* as a “knowledge of God and Jesus Christ.” Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 193-94.

¹⁰⁴ Kil, *Daniel*, 125.

has *new life* if he receives the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁵ The doctrine of the Holy Spirit that follows is emphatic about the role of the Holy Spirit in the world:

What does the Holy Spirit work in this world? 1. To teach all things about Jesus Christ (John 14:26). 2. To testify about Jesus Christ (15:26). 3. To guide and protect the believer (John 16:13). 4. To convict the world (John 16:8). 5. To pray for the believer (Rom. 8:26).¹⁰⁶

To what extent do we know the work of the Holy Spirit, even for justification? Kil seems to be aware of the necessity of new life, but does not actually answer that question. In this sermon, he does not tell us exactly what the work of the Holy Spirit is, either in conversion or in justification. Furthermore, after unfolding the works of the Holy Spirit, he declares that there are several ways to *receive* the Holy Spirit: “to repent (Acts 2:38), to pray in accord (Acts 1:14; 2:1-11), to testify to Jesus Christ (Acts 7:54-55), and to lay hands on the believers, who received the Holy Spirit, on a person (Acts 8:16-17).”¹⁰⁷ If we take his statements on the Holy Spirit literally, we can see that there is a great degree of confusion in Kil’s soteriology. A sharp dispute arises over the nature of the human will in his thinking. Does the power of the will enable us to *voluntarily receive* the Holy Spirit? Or does God give us moral ability to receive the Spirit in the ways specified? For the Reformers, the fallen will is absolutely unable to receive the Holy Spirit without God’s unmerited grace.

Kil mentions the connection between the Holy Spirit and regeneration:

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 75. This is his comment on John 6:63 and John 8:12.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 76.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 77.

First of all, if you want to be moved by the Holy Spirit, you should not offend the guidance of the Spirit. You should not put out the inspiration of the Spirit, *if you want to be saved*. And you can be filled with the Holy Spirit, *if you do not stop the rebirth of the Spirit* [John 3:3-5]. But, the *rebirth* can happen only once, no second time again; although you can be guided several times, you can be moved several times, and you can be filled several times.¹⁰⁸

All this statement says is that God, in regenerating sinners, takes into consideration their decision, which is indeed in them prior to justification. The existence of human freedom is not denied or doubted; it is there, but not particularly recognized as such. To be sure, this is not an expression of justification in Reformed theological terms. Kil's argument rests on one point: a human act becomes acceptable to God before justification. Again the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is blemished with ambiguity. Kil himself, as we have seen before, makes his position unclear at times by affirming the existence of human action prior to justification.

There is another problem with Kil's conception: it mixes up justification and sanctification. The distinction does not survive well in Kil's soteriology. Is his emphasis on the works of the Holy Spirit consistent with the doctrine of the justification of the wicked and *sola fide*? Given the importance of the subject, what is questioned here is the entire structure of his soteriology. In his famous *Hataron* [Indolence], Kil reflects on salvation. He says that "he who believes in Jesus Christ is given the seal of Christ, so that he can enter the Kingdom of Achievement."¹⁰⁹ *Only a believer* who receives the seal of Christ will

¹⁰⁸ Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 34 (italics added).

¹⁰⁹ Sun-Ju Kil, *Hataron* [Indolence] (Seoul: Daehan Sungseohoe, 1904), 9.

receive a special grace, “an armor of awakening,” to avoid the harm of the “animal [*hata*: indolence]” and finally enter the Kingdom of Eternal Life.¹¹⁰

Kil further develops his position with a lengthy discussion of the strength of the believer who has the power of the armor of awakening given by divine grace. The whole purpose of this tract is to show that only a believer who receives divine grace will escape from the harm of *hata* [indolence], a part of the result of Adam’s sin, to enter the Kingdom of Achievement.¹¹¹

In his *Hataron* [Indolence], says Kil, we need to recognize that there are some people who can keep away from the danger of the animal [*hata*]. Kil is wrong to include some famous Oriental kings and scholars, such as the Chinese Emperor Yo and Confucius, along with Paul and the apostles of Jesus Christ in the list of the Kingdom of Achievement.¹¹² This list of Kil’s Kingdom of Achievement represents a step backwards, for he is mistaken to accept them in the list of the Kingdom of Achievement when he contends that only a believer who receives the seal of Christ can keep off the attacks of the evil animal [*hata*]. He then describes the various phases of confrontation between the list of the Kingdom of Achievement and the list of the Seal of Christ.

¹¹⁰ Kil, *Hataron*, 9-14. This tract tells about three kingdoms: the Kingdom of Hope, the Kingdom of Achievement, and the Kingdom of Everlasting. Its basic idea is similar to John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*. The Institute of Korean Church History Studies, 2:189; Rhie, *Study*, 16, 208-21.

¹¹¹ Kil, *Hataron*, 8-9; see also 1-17.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 16. However, I do not believe that Kil is willing to include these men in the list of the Kingdom of Eternal Life.

Unfortunately, both the term “the list of the Kingdom of Achievement” and “the list of the seal of Christ” are confusing, for they can refer to the believer. Kil sometimes falls into the same confusion when he asks “all of us” to accept the seal of the Master of the Mountain of Suffering, “You can do it,” so that we can enter the Kingdom of Achievement, instead of the seal of the Devil, “You cannot do it.”¹¹³ Although Kil does not forget to use the standard terminology of the gospel in this tract, what is implied by it is somewhat untraditional: there is no justification for the wicked. Justification does not actually occur *sola fide–sola gratia*, because of Christ alone, but rather is a justification of one’s own *active* power.

Kil’s vagueness on the relationship between the power of the will and God’s grace leads to four conclusions regarding Kil’s doctrine of justification. First, he does not clearly teach a doctrine of God’s grace in justification along the lines of the Reformers. Second, what he says about grace is not in itself wrong. Third, since his specific statements on justification are not always clear, it is not surprising that his doctrine of the Holy Spirit in soteriology is ambiguous, for Kil’s arguments emphasize both *human autonomy* and *divine grace* at the same time, rather than God’s will in justification. Fourth, since Kil’s doctrine of faith, lacking a suitable explanation of the relation between Adam and his posterity and

¹¹³ This *seal* appears to be just a certificate for the believer who already received an authentic stamp, *the seal of Christ*. At the conclusion, Kil clearly shows the influence of the positive thinking of Norman Vincent Peale. In-Soo Kim, “The Rev. Sun-Ju Kil’s Life and Preaching,” *Church and Theology* (volume 26), 67-68; Se-Ju Chung, “*Iljeha Jongmal Jaerim Shinangui Minjockkyowhoesajuk Wheechi Yeonkoo* [Studies on eschatology in Korean church history under the rule of Japanese imperialism]” (Th.M. thesis, Yonsei Theological Seminary, 1982), 57. Deok-Joo Rhie calls the theology of this tract “KyemongJuui Nesei Shinhack [an enlightenment theology of the world to come].” Rhie, *Study*, 208-21, 260.

failing to connect God's grace with justification, is highly misleading, it does not, when literally interpreted, support the principles of Reformed soteriology.

2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

In the previous section, we saw that Kil treats the act of faith in his discussions of anthropology and justification. In fact, we saw that the disagreements between Kil and Calvin are in the area of anthropology: Kil rejects Calvin's definition of total depravity in soteriology, and he argues that there is human ability to please God. Now that I have laid the groundwork, it is time to look at Kil's views on imputation. To analyze Kil's doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, we should look at his response to the gospel.

Before proceeding, I think it is appropriate to recall Kil's statements on the relationship between Adam and his posterity. Kil does not make it clear in his sermons whether there is any *biological* or *legal* relationship between Adam and his posterity. Indeed, he does not deal with the doctrine of imputation very often in his sermons. However, in discussing union with Christ in his sermon "Three Blessings for Those Who Are in Jesus Christ," Kil seems to reveal a correlation between Adamic and Christological imputation:

The "law" in the "law of sin and death" [Rom. 8:2] means a rule or a principle. Human beings are born and die in the law of death. This is an inevitable truth. There is nothing but for them to walk on the railroad track of sin and death just like a train must run only on the railroad track: no one can escape from this. The track of sin and death will arrive at Hades: it will terminate in hell. Neither foolish women and men nor saintly wise men can free themselves from this principle, for all men are sinners and must die. What a wretched man I am! Who will rescue me from this railroad track of sin and death?¹¹⁴

This statement includes a number of important elements in Kil's concept of the human condition. For instance, it stresses that everyone is subject to the law of sin and death. Indeed, this is precisely the kind of statement that we may point to as an example of what makes Kil's doctrine of sin acceptable. Secondly, Kil does not exclude the necessity of Christ's righteousness for all men. Calvin himself, as we saw in chapter 3, emphasizes the necessity of Christ's righteousness as the very heart of his soteriology. Other statements by Kil underscore his point of view. For example, in the same sermon, Kil picks up the relationship between Adam and his posterity: "Everyone who is of Adam will rush on the railroad track of Adam, and the believer who is in Christ Jesus will rush on the railroad track of Jesus Christ, because Adam came from the law of sin and death, and Jesus Christ did from the law of the Spirit of life."¹¹⁵ Here Kil again seems to be aware of the correlation between Adamic and Christological solidarity.

However, this does not imply Reformed doctrine, even though he uses the terms "of Adam" and "in Jesus Christ." Imputation, does not occur, but if it did, it would be the imputation of one's own guilt to oneself, for this corresponds to the stress on the will over God's grace. A good example is what we will see regarding the birth of Adam's children after the Fall. "Cain was born as the result of Adam's sin after the Fall, while Abel was begotten as the fruit of righteousness after Adam's repentance."¹¹⁶ Clearly, there is a

¹¹⁴ Kil, *Daniel*, 28.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 28. There is no other place in all his sermons where we can find the expression "of Adam" except in this quotation.

¹¹⁶ See *ibid.*, 121.

problem here. At bottom, the difficulty is that there is no real explanation on the nature and the meaning of the “result of Adam’s sin after the Fall” or the “fruit of righteousness after Adam’s repentance.” Kil never defines “sin” in relation to the first sin of Adam. Kil separates Cain from Abel in conjunction with the first sin of Adam. It is useful to see how different elements of his system interact with one another and cause problems for the *solidaric* relationship between Adam and his children. His doctrine of man does not include the involvement of the whole human race in Adam’s sin. In other words, there are two parallel tracks of imputation: one represented by Abel, from Adam’s act of righteousness, and the other represented by Cain, from Adam’s sin after the Fall.¹¹⁷ Unfortunately, Kil does not connect Adam’s first sin to Abel in the doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin. The two tracks of imputation are kept apart and are never related. What is imputed to posterity are the sins that are committed by themselves, in the same manner as Adam’s sin is imputed to himself.

Of the union of Adam and his posterity, Kil has little to say. His stress on the will results from his distinctive doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin. This does not mean that Kil is unaware of human depravity.¹¹⁸ However, he acknowledges a *partial* corruption of human beings, which appears to be somehow similar to Timothy Dwight’s view.¹¹⁹ In this way, the act of the will exercising moral ability can cause the “loss of God’s

¹¹⁷ Cf. Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 121.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 97; Kil, *Daniel*, 187.

¹¹⁹ It has already been noted that Dwight uses the term the inheritance of “hereditary corruption” in reference to connection with Adam. He excludes Edwards’s notion of solidarity. As a result, men become an *actor* of their own sins.

righteousness” with which they are endowed like Adam.¹²⁰ In this paradigm, Adam’s descendants are imputed with the guilt of their own sin. This doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin eventually stresses the power of the will in justification.

Nevertheless, Kil does not give up the element of union contained in the theory as we have seen above, namely the participation of Adam’s posterity in his sin. This offers his descendants a solid ground for participation. Human beings meet with “destruction,” Kil explains, “for our ancestor Adam did not obey God’s command, but fell into the *temptation* of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.”¹²¹ It is a participation in the result of Adam’s sin. In other words, it is neither a participation in Augustine’s *biological* propagation nor a participation in Calvin’s *legal* union. Rather, it is a participation in the “curse,” which is the result of Adam’s sin.¹²² Imputation is not a transaction that attributes Adam’s guilt to his descendants. Rather, it is grounded in their participation in the worldly system of the curse as the result of Adam’s first sin:

While by falling into the temptation of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, human life should perish and the world should suffer damage, our human society receives a great benefit from it [the temptation].... Human beings are not an animal of automatism, but are the animals that are created with absolute freedom and power.... The descendants of Adam overcame difficulties, which were several times more difficult than the temptation of Adam.¹²³

¹²⁰ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 183. Kil clearly indicates here that there are people “who lost God’s righteousness already.” This is crucial evidence that shows no connection between Adam’s first sin and his descendants.

¹²¹ Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 131 (italics added).

¹²² Kil often emphasizes *curse* or *punishment* as the result of Adam’s sin. Kil, *Daniel*, 117; Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 122, 128, 138; Kil, *Hataron*, 9.

¹²³ Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 131-33.

Their participation in the result of Adam's sin begins when they face *temptation* like Adam. As the world becomes a place of curse and punishment, human beings come to live under this system. Under this system, human beings are destined to overcome the difficulties of temptation, for God tends to test them through this kind of temptation.¹²⁴ This participation theory of temptation is very important for Kil's doctrine of imputation, for he never seeks to resolve the participation of Adam's descendants in his sin with the principle of immediate participation as propounded by Calvin. Their participation in Adam's sin is constituted through the system of temptation. A further participation in Adam's sin does not appeal to the federal vocabulary like Jonathan Edwards.¹²⁵ Rather, it appeals to human freedom through this system of temptation. This type of argument substitutes the authority of the free, autonomous man for divine grace in justification, and it finally places the locus of salvation within autonomous man rather than God's acceptance by grace alone.

Kil finds in this system of temptation the relationship between the sin of Adam and his descendants. He argues that the act of Adam's descendants in justification must be freely exercised in this system of temptation; there is no thought of the fallen will requiring the sheer grace of God. Even Kil's appeal to the law of sin and death is an appeal to the needs of the free man who has an active power of the will. This is practically the same pattern of argument found in the New Divinity, and it is not particularly different from the

¹²⁴ Ibid., 132-33.

¹²⁵ Kil includes Abraham, Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and Jesus Christ in the list of people who overcame the difficulties of temptation with the power of absolute freedom given by God. Ibid., 133-34.

approach of Timothy Dwight. Kil never really explains the involvement of the whole human race in Adam's sin after the Fall.

An important question relating to the doctrine of Adam's sin, especially in relation to sinners, is the doctrine of Christ's atonement. In his sermon "Seven Words of Christ on the Cross (4)," Kil speaks of Christ's atonement as a vicarious sacrifice for the wicked:

Christ's atonement for sins does include not only *our responsibility to experience* but also an *actual transfer* of our sins and punishment. To *transfer* human sins to Christ means not only a work of spiritual meaning (but *only* a *legal* logic), but also a transference of the heavy burden of guilt to Christ just as other's troubles are transferred to our body when we sometimes take over other's troubles.¹²⁶

Here Kil refers to Christ as absolutely essential in the work of redemption. A common theme in these sermons on the cross of Christ is that of "vicarious sacrifice."¹²⁷ In describing this vicarious sacrifice, Kil uses a *forensic* concept of atonement, although he never uses forensic terminology to explain justification.¹²⁸ Kil is certainly not reluctant to use the orthodox Protestant language of legal justification. However, a judicial and declaratory act of God is not mentioned at this level. That is, justification for Kil has nothing to do with *legally* declaring a sentence by God.¹²⁹ Within this *legal* framework in justification, the concept of imputation played an important role for the Reformers.

¹²⁶ Kil, *Daniel*, 138 (italics added).

¹²⁷ There are seven sermons under the title of "Seven Words of Christ on the Cross." Ibid., 117-47.

¹²⁸ Sproul rightly points out that the "atonement is vicarious because it is accomplished via imputation." R. C. Sproul, *Faith Alone: The Evangelical Doctrine of Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1955), 104. Unfortunately, Kim does not connect the atonement of Christ to his imputed righteousness.

¹²⁹ Cf. Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 182-83.

Kil clearly speaks of the transfer of human sins to Christ through the redemptive work of Christ. What, then, is the role of faith in this transfer? This is no small question, especially in light of the justification controversy. The issue focuses on what is essential to the gospel. In his sermon, “The Righteous by Faith,” Kil says, “Whom shall we believe to be a justified person? Only believe in Jesus Christ *alone*.”¹³⁰ But what is meant by “believe” here? Since in his sermons he speaks of *faith* in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, it appears to mean “receive the true knowledge of Christ.”¹³¹ Certainly, for the Reformers, a person becomes *legally* just through true faith in Christ as Savior *sola gratia*. A crucial question, however, still remains: Does faith in Christ as Savior include a trust in the gospel? Does saving faith require a trust in the righteousness of Christ alone as imputed to the believer? Kil presents the *role* of faith as that of receiving the “benefits of salvation”:

However, the universe could not reach completion, because men are imperfect, since they are imperfect beings as they are under the power of sin, the devil, and death. Now, the universe reaches completion, for the Lord has completed *the highway of salvation* for mankind through the cross; and the completion of the way of salvation and the universe brings the love of God to completion. To see the cross is to see the center of the universe. *To believe the cross is to possess the benefits of salvation.* And to see the cross is to see the climax of his love.¹³²

Kil does not go further into the idea of such a *legal* transaction, just as he does not in the case of the Adamic imputation. This brevity is probably due to the role of faith in soteriology he is defending. With the role of faith, Kil justifies the active power of free will

¹³⁰ Ibid., 182 (italics added).

¹³¹ He also uses the words “welcome” or “accept.” Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 2, 59. Cf. *ibid.*, 17-18, 54, 156, 182-93; Kil, *Daniel*, 123-24, 156; Kil, *Hataron*, 12.

¹³² Kil, *Daniel*, 144 (italics added).

in justification. The question remains: How is that righteousness of Christ available to the believer? Kil defines faith as that which connects the redemptive work of Christ with the act of faith, providing the wicked with a foundation for their “union with Christ through faith.”¹³³ This *union* with Christ, whereby believers are said to be “in Christ,” is the basis for their right to the benefits of salvation.¹³⁴

Neither can man do nor can the power of the law do it [to rescue us from the railroad track of sin and death]. But only God can do it; and He does it through the cross of Jesus Christ. God does it by the law of the Spirit of life through Jesus Christ.... Therefore, *a person who is in Jesus Christ* can escape from the railroad track of sin and death and run on the railroad track of the Spirit and life.... This railroad track of life takes its course in the direction of heaven, and it will terminate at the eternal world of rest.¹³⁵

Kil does not deny that we are united with Christ through the act of faith. Kil, as we have seen before, sees the righteousness of Christ as a necessary condition for our justification. He thinks that a person is justified by the righteousness of Christ. For Kil, the righteousness of Christ is available to those “who are in Jesus Christ.” When the believer exercises his faith, he then possesses “righteousness,” which is the ground of justification.¹³⁶ Kil also describes faith as a “hand” with which to possess righteousness.¹³⁷ By calling faith a hand in his theology, the righteousness by which a person is justified is

¹³³ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 150.

¹³⁴ Kil, *Daniel*, 28-29.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 28 (italics added).

¹³⁶ Ibid., 29.

¹³⁷ Kil also offers faith as “a hand to obtain salvation.” Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 138.

not the *alien* righteousness of Christ in the Reformers, for this image of faith as a *hand* exposes the *synergistic* view of justification in Kil.¹³⁸

Is there a correlation between God's will and man's will in justification? Kil does deal with election in his sermons several times. He defends Paul's idea of election in his comments on Romans 8:29-30 in his sermon, "The Chain of God's Love."¹³⁹ This image of the *chain* of God's love reflects the fact that God "*foreknows, predestines, specially calls, justifies, and glorifies*" the believer.¹⁴⁰ The doctrine of God's foreknowledge is explicit in Kil's sermons. In his sermon, "The Purpose of Choosing Us," Kil tends to affirm that election takes place according to the divine plan, as shown in the chosen people:

God *chose* Noah to be the father of humankind, Abraham to bless all the people, and Joseph to rescue the twelve tribes of Israel. Indeed, He *chose* Moses to give the law, and Joshua to lead the *chosen* people of Israel. What, then, is the purpose of *choosing* us by the Lord?¹⁴¹

The purpose of election according to Kil is to produce the fruit of "righteousness," the fruit of the "gospel," and the fruit of "the Holy Spirit."¹⁴² Does, then, God's foreknowledge precede regeneration in Kil's soteriology? If Kil says that God's foreknowledge becomes effective before the wicked come to Christ, then he is not in serious conflict with the Reformers, because God's foreknowledge is correlated with the imputed act of God in justification. God's foreknowledge for Kil, however, does not cover

¹³⁸ Cf. Sproul, *Faith Alone*, 107-109.

¹³⁹ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 22.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid (italics added). Cf. Ibid., 19, 38, 44, 56; Kil, *Daniel*, 25.

¹⁴¹ Kil, *Daniel*, 157 (italics added).

the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Although Kil is willing to maintain the doctrine of election, union with Christ is nevertheless contingent on the exercise of free will. In other words, he affirms the concept of divine foreknowledge, but does so only after grounding it in man's absolute freedom in salvation.

Kil's doctrine of divine foreknowledge is only repeating what is already shown in the doctrine of the justification of the wicked in this study. Kil, in his sermon "The Faith of Jews and the Faith of Magi," also calls for the exercise of faith in the sense of the *active* power of free will: "Why are the chosen Jews abandoned while the Gentiles are saved? Because the environment of faith is different from the exercise of faith."¹⁴³ The important thing to notice here is that human "environment" has no positive function whatsoever in justification. On the contrary, it is precisely this act of faith which earns the eternal life. For Kil, the story of the Jews and the Magi in Matthew 2:1-18 shows that if you believe, "you will be justified" by the act of faith.¹⁴⁴ Here he is advocating neither God's sovereignty in salvation nor the efficacious grace of God in justification. Rather, he attempts to remove the will's dependence on God in salvation.

Do we, then, have to leave out the freedom of the will in justification? John Frame provides a rather profound analysis of the relationship between God's sovereignty and human responsibility:

Often, theologians assume that any sovereignty we describe to God must remove spontaneity and freedom from man. This is an error of hyper-Calvinists, who

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 90.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 91.

compromise human responsibility in order to maintain divine sovereignty, and of Arminians, who do the reverse. Unwittingly, both hyper-Calvinists and Arminians at this point see God and man on a common scale of being, so that anything ascribed to God must be taken from man, and vice versa.¹⁴⁵

Here we should note the importance that Frame places on the correlation between God's sovereignty and human freedom. The underlying message behind all of this is that we should be "aware of all aspects of the divine-human relationship."¹⁴⁶ Often, on the one hand, one theologian tends to ignore the act of faith in order to focus on God's sovereign act in justification. On the other hand, another theologian, like Kil, tends to wipe out the work of the Holy Spirit as divine grace in order to stress the freedom of the will.

Kil also does not hesitate to grant that human beings are able to please God and earn his grace with their free activity. This view is severely criticized by Berkouwer. On Berkouwer's view, divine sovereignty extends to the correlation between the act of faith and divine grace in justification:

Faith in the correlation bespeaks the working of the Holy Spirit directing man to God's grace. Thus understood, faith can never make God's justifying act of grace relative; it is faith, true faith, which honors the sovereignty of grace. And this is what the reformers and the confessions meant by speaking of faith as an instrument, ... as the passivity of faith. Such concepts in no way deny the activity of faith, its grasp of its object, or its working itself out in love.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ John Frame, *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1995), 81. This is a quote from his discussion of determinism and freedom. I have quoted Frame's comment on freedom, for I have seen a similar dilemma in many Christians, especially in the relationship between God's sovereignty and human responsibility in the doctrine of justification. This is a very sensitive area in the doctrine of justification to discuss.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 81-82.

¹⁴⁷ G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Justification* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), 178.

For Kil, the act of faith makes a connection to the imputation of Christ's righteousness. That is, the obedient act of the will initiates the work of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Thus, the imputed act of God in justification does not occur in Kil's soteriology. Kil remains unchanged by Calvin's notion of divine initiative for the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, for Kil's idea of *union* with Christ is basically rooted in the notion of free will. Likewise, the act of the free will precedes the imputed act of God in justification. This view nullifies the notion of *sola fide–sola gratia* in the justification of the Reformers.

To whom are the benefits of the union with Christ granted in Kil's soteriology? Kil's doctrine of faith avoids making human beings passive in the process of salvation, even in union with Christ. But does his emphasis on human inability underscore God's unmerited initiative in justifying the wicked? Faith for the Reformers never denies human participation in justification. If Kil goes on stressing the active role of faith, as he does in justifying the wicked, it will eventually be impossible to distinguish his view from the Arminian conception that men can make the fundamental choice to receive the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Does Kil's argument finally become similar to Arminian theory?

Perhaps Kil's "highway of salvation" enables him to have a strong doctrine of divine grace together with a strong doctrine of human freedom.¹⁴⁸ Because God prepares the highway of salvation *sola gratia* through the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, he removes the barrier of human sin, which is caused by Adam's sin, to "obtain God's

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Kil, *Daniel*, 144.

righteousness.”¹⁴⁹ The works of the wicked cannot earn any meritorious value in themselves for the justification of their sins. “Indeed, only God can forgive sins, and then only the Son of Man can atone for the sins of man, because man, who is the image of God, commits sins.”¹⁵⁰ What this statement indicates is that Christ is given by divine grace due to human “inability” to “redeem” himself from the guilt and the punishment of sins.¹⁵¹ But divine grace stops short at the imputation of the unmerited righteousness of Christ. Each person is able to attract divine favor, since the barrier for salvation, which cannot be removed by human works, is collapsed by the redemptive work of Christ. That is, there is an antecedent grace of Christ for everyone, which is constituted by God in justifying the wicked.

To accomplish this, Christ has already and fully completed his part in God’s grace by his vicarious sacrifice. Human consent to the gospel depends completely on this antecedent grace of God through the atoning work of Christ. Here Kil brings in his idea of unconditional grace to further elucidate the part that is to be played by the wicked: “Although salvation is granted by unmerited grace, the thief had to prepare the five elements, since everyone must prepare five conditions of faith for receiving God’s grace.”¹⁵² On Kil’s view of union, it is true that the thief actively received Christ, yet this

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 187.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 146.

¹⁵¹ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 97, 101.

¹⁵² Kil, *Daniel*, 122.

act was grounded on no more than the vicarious atonement of Christ. Human beings play their own part in this act of union by exercising the active power of the will.

In order to establish a saving union with Christ, human beings have to accept him, welcome him, believe him, and know him, because God gives us “the absolute freedom of the will.”¹⁵³ Here Kil blends the notion of human depravity in some degree with the active power of the will by his distinctive notion of divine grace in justification. Thus, Kil’s notion of divine sovereignty in the union with Christ allows human beings to respond by the act of faith.

What happens to a person who responds to the gospel? Kil thinks that justification is appropriated by the person who is *in Jesus Christ*. It is not surprising that Kil relates union with Christ to the double transfer of the Reformers:

The satisfaction of righteousness, the fulfillment of righteousness, is the third happiness for the person who is in Jesus Christ, since “in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.” He who does not live according to the sinful nature does not run on the railroad track of sin, and he who lives according to the Spirit runs on the railroad track of the Spirit of life. To the latter God fulfils the righteousness.... No one can be justified by the law; but the law only reveals righteousness.¹⁵⁴

In other words, Kil attempts to fit in the notion of the double transfer in the Reformers as it happens in union with Christ: the imputation of one’s sins to Christ and the righteousness

¹⁵³ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*; 18, 54, 59, 150, 193, 104, 209; Kil, *Daniel*, 3, 75, 123-24, 156, 160; Kil, *Hataron*, 12-14; Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 126-31.

¹⁵⁴ Kil, *Daniel*, 29. Kil claims that for those who are in Christ there is no condemnation (the first happiness). And they are set free from the sin and death (the second happiness).

of Christ to him.¹⁵⁵ The perfect righteousness of Christ is transferred to the wicked through union. In Christ, the believer is covered by the robe of Christ's righteousness.¹⁵⁶ Indeed, in Christ the guilt and the punishment of God are genuinely moved to the cross of Christ, and there is a transition from being wicked to being righteous.

But something bothers us with this way of thinking. From the same sermon quoted immediately above, Kil says that people can "receive" this righteousness "by the cross of Jesus Christ," and the Holy Spirit "completes the work of righteousness."¹⁵⁷ It appears that Kil regards one's acceptance of the cross of Christ as a significant act. Again, it is to be emphasized that Kil brings in the element of human consent to the gospel. At this point, it is to those individuals "who hunger and thirst for righteousness" that "this righteousness is granted."¹⁵⁸

The quoted passage seems to suggest that Kil would not completely rule out operation of the Holy Spirit in the experience of union with Christ. But in his peculiar idea of the receiver of Christ's righteousness by the "acceptance of the cross," Kil argues that the exercise of free will enables people to *receive the righteousness of Christ* without the help of the Holy Spirit. That position is not Calvinistic, but quite Arminian, if we understand the Reformers to teach that no one can embrace or receive the righteousness of Christ through human meritorious works, for the unmerited righteousness of Christ can be

¹⁵⁵ For the transfer of one's sins to Christ, see *ibid.*, 138.

¹⁵⁶ Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 159; Kil, *Daniel*, 96. Cf. Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 24, 89.

¹⁵⁷ Kil, *Daniel*, 29. Here the completion of the Spirit signifies sanctification.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

counted, reckoned, transferred, or imputed to one's account in union with Christ only by faith and by grace.

The fact is that the *exercise* of faith for Kil is *counted* as righteousness. How can the exercise of faith be accepted by God as righteousness? The exercise of faith is accepted by God as if Christ's righteousness is the person's when the person freely cooperates with God. Kil's view of union is not based on the federal headship of Jesus Christ. Kil speaks in terms of divine constitution, particularly the "faith of freedom" that is described in his *Yoogo*.¹⁵⁹ In other words, God has given the human race the "absolute freedom of the will," and he has also constituted it, so that we can experience the love of God and be saved through *the grace of the cross*, in the age of grace according to his dispensational eschatology.¹⁶⁰

The correlation of divine grace and the imputation of Christ's righteousness is not part of Kil's doctrine of justification. Kil is unaware of the correlation and does not defend the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. Perhaps the denial of Adamic imputation eventually leads to the denial of the work of the Holy Spirit as divine grace in justification.¹⁶¹ At the same time, his arguments are not the product of the Reformers. His sermons reveal that Kil himself does not understand the two phases of Adamic and Christological imputation in terms of solidaric relation or federal headship. Adamic and Christological imputation is definitely an area in which there is a great deal of difference

¹⁵⁹ Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 127-34.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 24, 89-90. Kil also calls this age "the age of the Holy Spirit." *Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Kil, *Daniel*, 28-29.

between Kil and the Reformers. Kil would extol the freedom of the will as preferable, while the Reformers would avoid such a distinction. Kil understands faith as actively seizing God's favor, while the Reformers understand it more passively. For Kil, the act of faith alone connects the believer to the righteousness of Christ.

At this point, Kil begins to have problems with Calvin's view. Doubtless, Kil is on weak ground when he says that one "can save" oneself "by faith" when he tells us to take the meaning of "self" seriously and to recognize that either "the merits of Christ" or "God's righteousness" can be obtained by the act of faith.¹⁶² Certainly, *the grace of the cross* calls for the act of faith to have an *actual transfer* of Christ's righteousness and therefore recognize the importance of the active power of the will.¹⁶³ Coming to saving faith is always a significant decision of human beings to produce the transfer of Christ's righteousness, according to Kil.

Unlike Calvin, Kil does not make clear in his sermons that the believer belongs to Christ by faith in union with Christ in transferring Christ's righteousness to him through the work of the Holy Spirit, as his acceptance of Christ definitively places him in God's family *sola gratia*. Kil ignores the solidaric relationship between Christ and the believer *sola fide-sola gratia*. It is certainly true in Kil's soteriology that the universality of the gospel offer through Christ's sacrifice reflects God's love for the human race, but it is neither God's love for the whole human race *in Adam* as the federal head, nor God's intention to establish his kingdom *in Christ* as the new federal head, in which the imputation of Christ's

¹⁶² Kil, *Kangdaebogam*, 9, 182-83.

righteousness takes place by faith alone through God's grace alone because of Christ's righteousness alone.

To sum up, Kil's doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is a consistent system. Throughout the order of salvation, the believer's act of faith is consistently presented as the exercise of the freedom of the will. His arguments on justification frequently show the idea of the *grace of the cross*, but they can be viewed as constituting a distinctive conception of *divine grace* in the atoning work of Christ.¹⁶⁴ Justification, in Kil's theology, is far from the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers, for God is obliged to respond to the human race.

With Kil, an antecedent grace of God through the cross appeals to *autonomous* man through the freedom of the will in justification. Kil finds in this pattern of the *freedom of the will* human participation both in Adam's sin and in the righteousness of Christ. That is, the act of the will provides a connection both with Adam's first sin by the system of temptation and with God's work on the cross in the form of union with Christ for the imputation of Christ's righteousness by the act of faith. Regeneration for Kil means becoming *partakers* of the *grace of the cross* in *union* by the act of faith.

Kil's doctrine of justification compromises God's sovereign grace in favor of human responsibility. Kil thinks that a person who exercises his free will is certainly saved on account of Christ's redemptive work, regardless of the work of the Holy Spirit. The gospel offer will be sufficient to encourage the exercise of the will to eventually produce

¹⁶³ Cf. Kil, *Daniel*, 29, 138, 144.

the act of faith. It is an offer for each person to act responsibility in justification. In that sense, grace is really given to the human race through the cross; it comes into the nature of the human race, in such a way that it is a responsibility of human nature, providing a new power to obtain God's favor in justification.

The main theme of Sun-Ju Kil's preaching is love. Repentance and regeneration are also very important in his theology. He recognizes humanity's overwhelming need for the love of God because of human depravity. However, the Reformed tradition ceases to be the source of his doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Rather, the uniqueness of his theology resides in eschatology. By stressing the second coming of Christ, he is driven to emphasize dispensational eschatology under the rule of Japanese imperialism. Through his revivalist movement, there were dramatic changes in the lives of Koreans. Even though his movement created evangelistic zeal, there is a missing link from the Reformed tradition to Sun-Ju Kil. The legacy of the Reformation—especially the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness by faith alone and grace alone—does not exist in his theology.

¹⁶⁴ Kil believes that our faith is "grounded on the cross of Jesus Christ." Jin-Kyung Kil, *Yoogo*, 23.

C. Ik-Doo Kim (1874-1950)

In the second period of Korean revival, Ik-Doo Kim, a strong defender of the infallibility of the Bible, stands firmly in the doctrine of God's love. People were so moved by his sermons that they would cry out, praise, and be filled with the gracious love of God. The crusades of Ik-Doo Kim attracted many people in Korea. Ik-Doo Kim is well known as the "Moody in Korea."¹⁶⁵ To him, the cross of Christ becomes the power of the believer to overcome all sins. To raise the question of the cross of Christ is to show how far he comes in considering the doctrine of justification, which is the core of the gospel. Before we move on to a discussion of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Ik-Doo Kim, we must ask how the fundamental view of freedom affects human ability.

1. The Justification of the Wicked

For Kim, the justification of the wicked is attributed entirely to God's love, but without denying some form of human cooperation with God's grace, usually discussed in terms of "prayer" or "the baptism of the Holy Spirit." What is interesting is that Kim, who is so vigorously opposed to the concept of *phenomenal sign* in the Pentecostals as the work of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless is willing to tolerate the notion of miraculous healings accompanied by the Holy Spirit through prayer.¹⁶⁶ For Kim, the Holy Spirit does play an

¹⁶⁵ Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 155, 162; Hyun Choi, *Dae Boohungsas* [The great revivalist] (Seoul: Jerusalem Press, 2000), 141.

¹⁶⁶ Kim was in opposition to the sign of *speaking in tongues* as an evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecostalism. Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 160-1, 155-6; Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 41-63; Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean*, 60; Min, *Iljehui*, 279-80, 297-300; Min, *Hankukkidock*, 398;.

important role in justification. To know the role of the Holy Spirit in Kim, we must see the structure of his theories of justification as clearly as possible.

Unlike Sun-Ju Kil, Kim does not reflect on the importance of original sin when discussing the beginning of justification. In his sermon “Understanding,” he clearly states that human beings must understand sin. At the same time, he defines sin as “not only disobedience to commands but also not serving the heavenly Father whole-heartedly.”¹⁶⁷ This is somewhat Kim’s view of the doctrine of original sin shown in his sermons. We should now proceed to analyze his views regarding sin.

When discussing the structure of the soul in his sermon “Self-control,” Kim does no more than maintain that the self is dangerous:

Neither a sharp sword nor a gun is fearful. Rather *self* is a horrible being. We must be careful of *self*. In this *self*, we have inner self and external self. First of all, we must be careful of inner self. Now! Let us think whether this inner self does more good than harm to others. In the beginning our inner self is made holy, but we become a dangerous man after committing sin. It is truly appropriate for the Bible to say, “It is more evil than all things.” First, a person can easily be proud.... A person who is not careful of self is very dangerous and hopeless. In order to save ourselves and others, we must be careful of our inner self.¹⁶⁸

What is the nature of *self* here? How can *self* become a horrible and dangerous one? Does he try to establish the relation between Adam’s sin and the whole human race? Perhaps Kim approaches the connection between Adam and his posterity when he says that “we become a dangerous man after committing sin.” However, Kim never preaches on the

¹⁶⁷ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 3.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 6-7 (italics added).

effects of original sin or the wrath of God in his sermons. He simply speaks of the results of the Fall without any further explanation. This is made clear in the following statement:

The devil changed the world of the peaceful reign into *the world of sickness, suffering, and death* with one word, that is, “You will not surely die. For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”¹⁶⁹

It is important to note that Kim never speaks of the relation between Adam’s sin and his posterity when he teaches the doctrine of *self*.¹⁷⁰ Unfortunately, Kim does not explain the doctrine of original sin further in his sermons. This is the only statement that shows the relation between Adam’s sin and the world. We see here a concern for “sickness, suffering, and death,” rather than a concern for the doctrine of original sin or the effects of sin. This emphasis allows Kim to persuade people to seek the grace of God through prayer, a theme that dominates his sermons. Kim discusses an *active* capacity to receive the gift of God through *prayer*, although he never speaks of any distinctive notion of the will. The concept of *prayer* is one of Kim’s major concerns, and it is this element in his thought that brings him the reputation as the man of the “movement of prayer, healing, and miracles.”¹⁷¹ Kim maintains that God’s gift through prayer is totally of grace in statements like the following in his sermon “The Religion of Prayer”:

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 7 (italics added).

¹⁷⁰ In his all published sermons, Kim does not unveil the Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity. However, he indicates in his sermon “The Demonstration and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit” that everyone is a “sinner.” Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 54. Nevertheless, one will never find the doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s sin to his descendants in his sermons.

¹⁷¹ Min, *Iljehau*, 297, 299; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 156; Chun-Kun Han, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 63-143; Park, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 51-123; Byung-Hack Oh, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 111-44; Hyun Choi, *Daeboohuingsa*, 91-104.

God says, “Ask and it will be given to you.” Whatever we ask will be given to us. If we ask God to give the Holy Spirit, He will give us the Spirit; if we ask God to give us rain, He will give us rain; whatever we ask, says God, it will be given to us. Isn’t this word a joyful permission? Of all true grace, this word that everyone who asks receives is the great grace while we have so many difficulties in living in this world.¹⁷²

Kim’s notion of prayer in this sermon is crucial to the doctrine of justification. In his view, one can speak of participating in grace by recognizing some kind of capacity through prayer to receive grace. Kim affirms the ability of prayer under God’s grace, he nevertheless writes that the capacity must be based on free choice by God’s grace, and the role of prayer supports nothing more than his idea of human consent to God’s work of salvation. This point is of no small importance in relation to justification, for it reveals the idea of human ability in Kim.

Instead of presupposing human depravity as human “inability” to do good before God, Kim stresses that the power of prayer is the ultimate principle for salvation. Perhaps *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles] is the best place to begin a discussion of the system of prayer in Kim. In order to prove the miraculous works, a society called *Yijuckmyungjunghoe* (“a society for the proofs of miracles in Kim’s ministry”) attempts to deal with “inquiries about miracles” and issue “certificates for the healed” through his ministry.¹⁷³ This book is very important to the theology of Ik-Doo Kim, for it essentially contains the authentic statements of Ik-Doo Kim without adding the editor’s views.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 9.

¹⁷³ *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles], i-ii; Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean*, 60; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 156; Min, *Iljehai*, 291; Chun-Kun Han, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 106-43; Yong-Kyu Park, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 123-28; Byung-Hack Oh, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 136-44; Hyun Choi, *Daeboohuingsa*, 150-78.

Kim's distinctive teachings on prayer are clearly shown in this book.¹⁷⁵ "Prayer" is the issue, that is, the power of prayer to perform the healing miracles by God's grace. Speaking of the relation of God's miracles to salvation, Kim says: "God has the great purpose for performing the miracles: not only to heal the sick but also to reveal the power of God and his great grace, so that people can see them and be saved."¹⁷⁶

This emphasis on the power of prayer is found in *Yijuckmyungjung*. One should expect to find a strong doctrine of human responsibility from this book. One should also expect such a doctrine, not only because of his emphasis on prayer, but also because of his discussion of miraculous healings, which often have the purpose of converting people. Kim's treatment of prayer in this book focuses on the act of faith. This book shows that for Kim the grace of justification comes to us through prayer because of the works of Christ.

Her husband Byung-Jun Gan did not believe, ... but persecuted Jesus Christ. He went through severe troubles in trying hard for his wife who had been sick for 22 years because of her fatal illness, but could not cure her illness. After praying several times in the name of God and Jesus Christ, he could see the perfect healing with his own eyes.... He decided to believe in Jesus Christ right after that, saying, "This is the power of God. It is incredible," and preached the gospel over the whole village by testifying, "Believe in Jesus Christ."¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ *Yijuckmyungjung*, i. Rev. Taek-Kwon Im, the chief editor, says that "the members of this society personally examined them all after seeing with their own eyes, touching with their own hands, participating, recording, and finally editing them." Thus, this book clearly includes the quotations of Kim's sermons in revival meetings. The reader can also see so many photos as the proofs of miraculous healings in this book.

¹⁷⁵ Indeed, this book explains the relation between prayer and healings, for it basically defends the "movement of prayer, healing, and miracles" in his ministry.

¹⁷⁶ *Yijuckmyungjung*, 123. In this manner, the book interprets the miracles of Jesus Christ as teaching "the power of faith." Ibid., 23, 90. When he mentions the power of prayer coming from grace, he is referring to "the healing power" of God. Ibid., i. Kim's emphasis on this grace, the healing power, is apparent in this book.

¹⁷⁷ *Yijuckmyungjung*, 73.

One should keep in mind the importance that Kim places on the power of prayer. Often he assumes that prayer, healing, and miracles lead people to justification. With his distinctive view of divine grace in justification through the work of the Holy Spirit, Kim is able to maintain a strong view of human freedom. We should note that he sees no difficulty in emphasizing that the wicked can obtain salvation by the active power of the will through the means of prayer, healing, and miracles. In his analysis, Kyung-Bae Min rightly suggests a lesson that Kim's view finally teaches:

But, as a significant fact, Ik-Doo Kim left a lesson that miraculous healings help neither spread the gospel nor promise to make a contribution to society. Essentially, he did not intend to gain anything from healings. But, as a result of it, he left a heartbreaking lesson.¹⁷⁸

Similarly, Min rightly points out that Kim's doctrine of faith is motivated by "an optimistic view of man."¹⁷⁹ Thus, it is reasonable to assume that Kim's "positive view of faith gives shape to human happiness, a strong motive for the healings of sicknesses."¹⁸⁰ The parallels are particularly strong in such areas as justification by faith, the role of good works, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.¹⁸¹

Kim's idea of the power of prayer can bring him the most severe criticism, for it seems particularly difficult to draw lines sharply enough to support the doctrine of

¹⁷⁸ Min, *Iljehai*, 335.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 314.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 315.

¹⁸¹ See the notion of righteous work in his sermon "The Manifestation and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit" in Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 52.

justification by faith alone: the lines between justification and sanctification, between saving grace and sanctifying grace. Clearly, Kim speaks of healing power as God's grace in relation to salvation:

Now you become a sick person and an unbeliever as in the past. Oh, isn't this a very fearful, indignant thing?... After receiving *a special grace*, this is a great sin that a believer did not overcome a vicious place by another offer.... Watch yourself, all the brothers and sisters, who received *the healing grace of God* in various meetings. I hope you have fear lest you lose faith.¹⁸²

Important questions arise at this point. What is the relation between faith and prayer in Kim? Can a believer lose his faith in Christ if the sickness comes back to him? A careful look at his teaching on the power of prayer will reveal serious weakness in it, for he seeks to describe how the power of prayer affects faith and does not make it clear what saving faith is in justification. Kim often refers to this pattern: a person who desires to have hands laid on him will receive healing, *divine grace*, and then become a "faithful believer."¹⁸³ Thus, Kim's claim that God gives grace and answers to prayers as divine grace is not based on Calvin's thought.

Let us take a closer look at this "divine grace." In *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles], Kim speaks of the grace that exists by gracious "miracles" within the power of prayer.¹⁸⁴ His idea of grace can never be understood as a saving grace in justification like Calvin; it can, however, be received by those who have "believing faith to be healed by

¹⁸² Ibid., 12-13 (italics added).

¹⁸³ Ibid., 76. This also explains the "great deal of grace," which signifies healing. Ibid., 77-78. Likewise, the healing of divine grace is prominent in this book. See *ibid.*, 13, 14, 23, 29, 163.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 22, 39, 121, 164.

prayer” or “come, see, and believe.”¹⁸⁵ Kim’s concern in this statement is to juxtapose the power of prayer with human ability in salvation. With respect to the power of prayer, Kim does give special attention to the doctrine of salvation in *Yijuckmyungjung*. Taek-Kwan Im in this book reaches the conclusion that miracles give people the fundamental basis of faith. Appropriately referring to this as the benefits of the grace shown in Kim’s ministry, Im concludes:

First, many churches in various areas have been greatly revived as a result of this grace. Since this grace has been shown up to today, so many people have gathered together and taken a bath of spiritual grace and have been healed, wherever revival meetings have been held in those churches which invited Kim, all over the country.... The unbelievers confessed, “It is impossible not to believe in God since we saw the power of God.” In every church, unbelievers said, “I will believe in him.”... “I want to believe. How can I refuse to believe since I saw that a disabled person in my village was totally healed after receiving a prayer to God.”¹⁸⁶

Kim’s soteriology is reflected when Im points out that grace provides people with divine power through the power of prayer. Im seems to be greatly impressed by Kim’s sequence of *prayer, healing, and miracles*. However, up to this point, as the book clearly shows, Kim does not make clear the doctrine of justification by faith alone in the message of the gospel.

The omission of any explicit reference to *sola fide* raises a disturbing question about the doctrine of justification. Does Kim assume that man has the capacity to earn divine favor through the power of faith?¹⁸⁷ By excluding the necessity of divine grace in justification in this book, Kim gives us one more reason to doubt his understanding of

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 29, 60.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 163.

¹⁸⁷ See *ibid.*, 90, 120.

grace.¹⁸⁸ Probably the strong emphasis on “belief through miracles” leads him to water down the doctrine of justification.¹⁸⁹ *Yijuckmyungjung* shows that the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers does not exist in Kim’s theology. Perhaps Kim was not willing to preach on the wrath of God because the people were suffering under the rule of Japanese imperialism.¹⁹⁰

An emphasis on the doctrine of faith and the status of humanity is found in his sermon “Escape from Weakness and Be Spiritual.” Interpreting gold as faith in Revelation 3:18, “to buy from me gold refined in the fire,” Kim urges us to have faith after asking, “How can you have faith?”

What does “gold” mean in “to buy from me gold refined in the fire”? It means *faith*. It is the *faith* of Abraham, the *faith* of Noah, and the *faith* of Moses. Then, how can you have *faith*? If you repent, God will give you *faith*. Abraham is not a special person. He is a man who repented.¹⁹¹

Kim declares here that the soul can repent and receive the faith of Abraham. This statement emphasizes the word *repent*, as it can receive the faith of Abraham in return. It reaffirms that human beings have *some* capability to earn divine favor, as *Yijuckmyungjung* treats the power of prayer. Contrary to Calvin, who speaks of the work of the Holy Spirit as

¹⁸⁸ The word *justification* cannot be found in *Yijuckmyungjung* [Proofs of miracles]. Im never says that Kim ever spoke of justification in his sermons. At this point, I believe that Kim was not often sensitive to the issue, apparently less than Sun-Ju Kil.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 34, 41, 120.

¹⁹⁰ Perhaps Kim thought that the message of God’s wrath and punishment would not be effective for evangelism while the people were already suffering such a severe ordeal. Rather, he may have thought that the message of hope and comfort shown in the miraculous works of God would be more attractive to them. Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 159; Min, *Iljehai*, 318-19.

¹⁹¹ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 82 (*italics added*).

something that operates right before the act of faith, Kim insists that the wicked can use the power of the will to be covered with the white *robe* of Christ through the act of faith by saying, “Let us wear a holy, clean *robe* like Moses and Daniel.”¹⁹² On this view, it would almost seem as if the wicked can initiate the beginning of justification through the active power of the will. It would also seem as if no justification is possible without the consent of human beings to the truth of the gospel, regardless of divine grace. Human consent to the gospel precedes the work of the Holy Spirit in Kim’s theology.

The unregenerate man cannot know what his need is if there is no explanation of the effects of sin, so how can he understand sin and the need for redemption in Christ? How does Kim present the gospel to the unregenerate who literally know nothing about the need for the sacrifice of Christ? Is there any role at all here for divine grace to play?

Kim at least is sometimes sensitive to the difficulty of the problem, though at many points in his sermons he seems quite unaware of the relationship between divine grace and faith in justification. The peak of his awareness of this issue can be found in his sermon “The Demonstration and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit,” where he uncharacteristically has some difficulty in formulating his views. Here he provides his understanding of what the justification of the wicked is:

It means that *justification is by faith* because the mind is always filled with the truth, as Paul the apostle wrote in Romans when he was in prison; he also wrote it in Ephesians, where it means that Jesus Christ is the Head and the church is His body. We can clearly see that Paul was always filled with the truth in his other epistles. “Streams of living water will flow from within him” in John 7:38 also means the overflow of the truth.¹⁹³

¹⁹² Ibid (italics added). We will discuss Kim’s notion of the *covering* of the white *robe* of Christ’s righteousness in the next section.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 56 (italics added).

Justifying the wicked, then, is no more than the overflow of the truth. The overflow of the truth indicates the fullness of the Holy Spirit; it is also somehow closely connected with union with Christ. Notice how Kim confuses justification by faith in relation to Romans 1:17 with sanctification as he argues that justification is by faith in this statement. This completely destroys the entire structure of Kim's soteriology, for at this point he is describing of mature believers, who are filled with the Holy Spirit, and thus are at a higher level than newborn believers. So it is the fullness of the Holy Spirit, with which a person is justified by faith, not by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Justification must be sought with proper desire if it is to be filled with the truth, that is, the fullness of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the wicked are justified by faith after regeneration in Kim's theology. It is not difficult for us to see how Kim completely departs from the Reformed doctrine of forensic justification by faith alone. Kim's soteriology includes neither the notion of the imputation of Adam's sin nor the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Also, God's initiative and the exclusiveness of grace are absent from his sermons.

Another development in theology that Kim argues is the idea that regeneration is separated from the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Speaking of regeneration in his sermon "The Baptism of the Holy Spirit," Kim draws our attention to his own experience: "I undoubtedly received the Holy Sprit three months after believing Jesus Christ."¹⁹⁴ Kim occasionally separates regeneration from the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as if there are two different phases of salvation, such as regeneration and the baptism of the Holy Spirit (or the

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 60.

“fire” of the Holy Spirit).¹⁹⁵ Thus, to believe in Jesus Christ and to receive the Holy Spirit are two different works of the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation. In this connection, Kim notes in his sermon “Sevenfold Narrow Gate” that he lost faith in Jesus Christ once, for he committed sin:

I quit drinking soon after becoming a communicant member. I explained that I quit drinking because I had a medicine called the Old and the New Testaments, when a friend, who used to keep company in drinking, asked me why I did not drink. But actually this was not a complete repentance. Afterwards my old friends took me to a tavern and forced me to drink, offering one glass of liquor after another until I finally got drunk. After taking the consequences into consideration and thinking of that, *I had to believe in Jesus Christ again*, I was stricken with shame to my mortification.¹⁹⁶

Kim in this sermon urges people to enter a narrow gate of *repentance* that signifies salvation. He discusses the problem of losing one’s faith in Jesus Christ after becoming “a communicant member.” Either a person becomes a Christian when he “believes in Jesus Christ” and may lose it by committing sin, or else he is “not a true believer until the Holy Spirit enters his heart.”¹⁹⁷ This also reflects Kim’s idea of the “loss of faith” that we saw in *Yijuckmyungjung*.¹⁹⁸ For Calvin, certainty is one of the most important ideas in his theology. He does not want the certainty of the word of God to rest on anything human. In Calvin’s thought, faith must rely on the promises of God in Christ Jesus.¹⁹⁹ For Kim, however, an

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 54, 59-60. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is interchangeable with the fire of the Spirit in Kim’s theology.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 107 (italics added). Kim calls the Old and New Testaments “a medicine” because the pronunciation of *Testament* in Korean means “medicine.”

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 42, 48.

¹⁹⁸ See *ibid.*, 12-13.

¹⁹⁹ Calvin would say that if you don’t have assurance, you don’t have faith because faith never doubts. Faith, in its deeper sense, is *trust*, *trust* in the promise of God in his theology. In his *Institutes of the*

unbeliever believes in Jesus Christ after repentance in one sense and sometimes fails to keep faith in Jesus Christ in another. It is very confusing that the two senses here are difficult to define and distinguish. In this sense, faith relies on human feeling, not on the word of God. His arguments on assurance of faith clearly show that Kim does not understand the consistency of *forensic* justification, by which God declares once for all that a person is justified by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ alone. In other words, he never really explains that all sin deserves death, but no sin destroys the justification that a person has in Christ.

Likewise, the doctrine of regeneration obviously appears contradictory if one believes in faith through repentance, but this apparent contradiction also exists on his view of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The same thing is true with another form of regeneration and the “baptism” by the Holy Spirit, the relation between regeneration and forgiveness of sins. In trying to explain this, his terminology gets a little uncertain, as in the following statement:

We [believers] cannot be baptized [by the Holy Spirit] if we hate others, if we are enemies to each other, and if we conceive devilish desire. It says that we should not preach the gospel until we are baptized by the Holy Spirit. Then, what is the baptism of the Holy Spirit? *Baptism* means *washing in water*. What is water? It is to wash, or to cleanse.... Truly unclean women and men are cleansed when they are baptized by the Holy Spirit.... To cleanse one's soul from sin is the baptism of the Holy Spirit.²⁰⁰

For Kim, the baptism of the Holy Spirit triggers a process that cleanses the sins of the believers. In Kim's system of salvation, the forgiveness of sins is separated from rebirth.

Christian Religion, Book II is a long chapter defining *faith*. John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battle, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960).

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 43-45 (italics added).

He does suggest that one should distinguish two kinds or phases of salvation: a phase of rebirth and a phase of the forgiveness of sins in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. If Kim separates the forgiveness of sins from regeneration, he will exclude the forgiveness of sins in justification. Never can this be accepted by the Reformers. Justification, on their view, clearly requires us to include the forgiveness of sins both in regeneration and in justification. Indeed, the Reformers do suggest an *ordo salutis*, in which regeneration precedes faith. However, they are speaking of “logical” precedence here and not temporal precedence, because *temporally* regeneration and faith “occur simultaneously.”²⁰¹

Kim proceeds at this point in his next sermon to launch into a crucial relationship between regeneration and repentance.²⁰² It is certainly true that Kim strongly emphasizes the necessity of repentance in relation to regeneration in speaking of four different levels of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit:

Third, internal inspiration, that is, inner inspiration, means regeneration.... In this way, once you reach the gate of regeneration, you begin to cry in bitter grief; although before regeneration you used to live a life of sin, and did not know the true Light, Jesus Christ, and listened to only filthy voices, and had no freedom of conscience under the chains of sin. Therefore, no one can be born again without repentance. Thus, the Lord says, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!” *Without having the inspiration of the Holy Spirit*, no one is able to grieve bitterly, for everyone is a sinner.²⁰³

²⁰¹ R. C. Sproul, *Grace Alone: The Heart of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 195-96, 144; Sproul, *Faith Alone*, 23-26. Basically, the faith of the Reformers sees regeneration as the immediate *monergistic* work of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, by which a person is saved from spiritual death to spiritual life. Regeneration also is the work of the Holy Spirit when the Spirit comes to indwell the soul of the person.

²⁰² For “The Demonstration and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit,” see Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 51-57.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 54 (italics added).

A question presents itself here: Is regeneration really the work of the Holy Spirit in Kim? To understand Kim's soteriology better, we should further explore his frequent references to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In his sermon "Receive the Holy Spirit," he insists that the wicked must receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit in order for them to know that there is heaven:

We believers cannot know there is heaven unless we receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Never can we know that we can go to heaven after death if we do not receive the Holy Spirit. Never can we understand it unless our spirit is illuminated by the fire baptism of the Holy Spirit.²⁰⁴

Kim also maintains that it is not possible to fully "become a Christian until the Holy Spirit enters our hearts."²⁰⁵ Similarly, Kim begins his sermon "The Baptism of the Holy Spirit" with a discussion of the notion of "fire baptism" and follows with a discussion of regeneration: "a person who receives the fire baptism of the Holy Spirit walks in the light, knows God, knows Jesus Christ, knows his sins, knows eternal life, and knows resurrection."²⁰⁶ Kim lays out what for him is a fundamental point: a person begins to be "inspired" by the Holy Spirit after being "baptized" by the Holy Spirit or "receiving" the Holy Spirit. Thus, he speaks of the beginning of regeneration. It is important to note the terms that Kim uses in discussing regeneration. He speaks of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a necessary condition for regeneration. In other words, if a person receives the Holy

²⁰⁴ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 47.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 48.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 59. In this sense, Kim, as we have seen above, insists that we must receive the *fire baptism* of the Holy Spirit in order to be "illuminated" and to know the existence of "heaven."

Spirit, he is able to be inspired by the Holy Spirit so that with the help of the Holy Spirit he can repent for justification.

But how can the wicked receive the Holy Spirit or be baptized by the Holy Spirit? Kim insists in his sermon “Receive the Holy Spirit” that a sinner receives the Holy Spirit through “prayer,” not by divine grace.²⁰⁷ There Kim asks, “Why don’t you want to pray? Why don’t you want to receive the Holy Spirit?... God surely gives us the Holy Spirit.”²⁰⁸ In this connection, he also emphasizes the power of prayer in his sermon “Who Is Blessed?” so that people can succeed: “Why don’t you want to pray? Because you don’t know the omnipotence of God.”²⁰⁹ In this way, the power of prayer is closely correlated to the baptism of the Holy Spirit and repentance. This paradigm of the power of prayer in regeneration is extremely crucial to understanding Kim’s doctrine of justification, for regeneration through the baptism of the Holy Spirit is fundamentally placed within the power of prayer. Also for Kim, repentance follows the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a result of God’s answer to prayer. Thus, he maintains an understanding of justification as totally the work of man through the power of prayer.

To sum up, the doctrine of justification is developed by Kim to show how the unregenerate, who have the power of prayer, can earn God’s favor for remission of sins and justification. At this point, the *ordo salutis* in Kim’s soteriology shows the *active* capability of human freedom: prayer precedes the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and repentance follows

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 49-50. Here Kim urges people to pray until they receive the Holy Spirit.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 50.

²⁰⁹ Yong-Kyu Park, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 173.

the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and then finally the wicked are covered with *the white robe*, which signifies justification in Kim, after receiving faith through repentance. Kim's aim is to safeguard the idea that righteousness is given to the wicked solely through *faith*.

However, he is very clear in his insistence that human beings can obtain justification through the system of prayer. It is totally works-righteousness: the wicked are justified by faith in Jesus Christ through *prayer alone*. Kim emphasizes human effort no less than the Arminian in justification. A true *sola fide–sola gratia* cannot be found in Kim's doctrine of justification. The primacy of divine grace in justification, which is the true content of the gospel, is totally absent from Kim's theology.

For the Reformers, faith and repentance are raised by the Holy Spirit *sola gratia*.²¹⁰ They dislike the thought of any human merit contributing to the justification of the wicked. Kim remains consistent in his doctrine of justification. His soteriology, with the strange idea of regeneration by the power of prayer, clearly has many problems.

2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

We have explored Ik-Doo Kim's view of justification, which is rooted in his doctrine of prayer. My critique has to do with the primacy of human ability to pray in his theology. I have also argued that Kim puts too much stress on the capability of the unbeliever to respond to the gospel. For Kim, God's sovereignty in both regeneration and justification gives every unbeliever an active power through prayer, by which they can

²¹⁰ It must be noted as we saw that faith in the Reformers is *trust* in the promise of God. Faith is not found in a vacuum. In other words, in Reformed theology saving faith has *content* that is the word of God.

receive faith and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to obtain salvation. Having said that, it will still be necessary to discuss how Christ's righteousness is transferred to an unbeliever in Kim's theology. Or may we ask what an unbeliever needs to be declared righteous? Does the quest for active power in prayer lead naturally to a certain kind of human status in relation to original sin? And does the active status of humanity play a dominant role in Kim's doctrine of imputation?

To place our discussion of the nature of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Kim, it is necessary to sketch its general relationship to the effects of sins and the necessity of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Kim thinks that it is impossible to be successful without prayer, due to human inability: "Therefore, human success depends on understanding human inability and on prayer to the omnipotent God. Daniel was such a person, and Moses also. Why don't you pray? Because you don't understand your inability."²¹¹ That might seem to be an unreal expectation, since in Kim's theology the total depravity of the Reformers was absent in his theology according to our previous analysis. Then what does he mean by "inability" here? Notice that *inability* here does not mean "human inability" to please God or to do good in God's eyes. Rather, it refers to the *powerlessness* of men comparing to the omnipotence of God. Yet this *inability* still leaves room for the *active* power of freedom. Also, Kim's theological conviction still draws its strength from the necessity of prayer in relation to the active power of the will, even with his idea of human inability.

²¹¹ Ibid.

Due to this inability or powerlessness, human efforts for repentance are necessary in Kim's soteriology. He goes on to give expression to the term *forensic declaration* in adding to the notion of inability:

Speaking of the world, after dealing with a case, a judge *declares* a verdict in accordance with law, if a person commits a crime. But the judge cannot absolve him from his guilt due to the established law of the country, even if the criminal confesses his guilt and grieves bitterly. In the same way, so does the law of God.²¹²

Does Kim discuss a forensic justification found in the Reformers? Kim actually speaks of the price of sins here, which demands payment of the criminal, but is impossible to pay by oneself. Kim states that the person is legally declared guilty due to his sin. He speaks of a legal declaration in order to address the sinner in terms of the law. However, no further development is found in his sermons. That is, it has nothing to do with a *forensic* justification by which God declares a person righteous. Not surprisingly, Kim's doctrine of atonement also does not involve a forensic issue. In other words, a forensic act of imputing punishment to Christ is not to be found in his doctrine of atonement.²¹³ However, Kim rightly notes here that the Lord, who died on the cross "to remit the sins of all the people, has authority to pay the price of sins, which neither the law of the world nor the law of God can do."²¹⁴ Kim makes a crucial point here that Christ satisfied the demand of God by his sacrifice on the cross. He speaks of the vicarious atonement that Christ pays the price of the

²¹² Ibid (italics added).

²¹³ It is appropriate to recall that Kim never preaches on the wrath of God. On the forensic act of imputing punishment, says Sproul, "The atonement also involves a forensic matter. God declares Christ to be 'guilty' of sin after the Son willingly bears for his people sins that are imputed or transferred to him. Here is imputation with a vengeance—indeed a divine vengeance. This forensic act of imputed punishment." Sproul, *Faith Alone*, 104.

sins of the wicked in emphasizing the transfer of the sins of the believer to Christ on the cross. Kim's understanding of what he calls the remission of sins directly correlates with his understanding of the cross and justification. Indeed, Kim rightly speaks of the wicked "who repent and believe the Lord and are forgiven" their sins because of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.²¹⁵

However, there remain some questions: How does Kim connect Adam's first sin with the sins of the human race? What kind of imputation can be expected with respect to sins? Significant for the present study would be a connection between Adam's first sin and his descendants, since there is an analogy between the way in which Adam's sin is transferred to the human race and the way Christ's righteousness comes to the wicked through imputation.²¹⁶ Kim does not show us a clear picture of the relation between Adam and his posterity. Rather, he often finds the effects of Adam's first sin in the world. For example, regarding the impact of Adam's sin, Kim makes a moderate claim like the following:

This world is truly an immoral world. Why does Jesus Christ call it an immoral world? How many drunken people are staggering on the streets around one o'clock in the morning in Seoul? How many times do men commit obscene acts upon women?... How much is the world *dangerous*? The world is full of carnal desire. This carnal desire commits sins in our minds.²¹⁷

²¹⁴ Yong-Kyu Park, *Ik-Doo Kim*, 174.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 173.

²¹⁶ There is also a fundamental difference between the scope of the imputation of Adam's sin and that of the imputation of Christ's righteousness as we saw in the fourth chapter.

²¹⁷ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 43-44 (italics added). He often uses the term "immoral" to express the sinfulness of humanity. Cf. *Ibid.*, 45, 83.

Thus, Kim acknowledges that every one is a sinner as a participant in this immoral world. However, in stressing the effects of Adam's sin on the world, the solidaric relation between Adam and his descendants is not mentioned. This is exemplified by his expression "the world of sickness, suffering, and death," as well as "dangerous self."²¹⁸

Apart from the reference to this world, Kim makes no mention of the relation between the sins of Adam and the whole human race. It is therefore the sins of all men themselves and not a relationship between them that adequately explains the sins of the human race in Kim. No imputation is in view in his doctrine of original sin.²¹⁹ Kim nowhere mentions union or the concept of divine constitution in this connection.

Without having any connection between Adam and his posterity, Kim builds his doctrine of atonement. It is clear from our analysis of his statements that Kim's doctrine of salvation is based on the vicarious sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Kim sees the sacrifice of Christ as a divine grace. It is also the foundation for prayer, healing, and miracles to Kim. For Kim, this *grace* of God is cooperative rather than operative, contrary to the view of the Reformers. What is the role of faith in imputation?

Kim does not deny that we are justified by Christ alone. How is righteousness appropriated by the believer? For Kim, righteousness is given to the believer by faith through repentance. However, when the believer cooperates with the power of prayer for repentance, the believer possesses the power of faith, which then becomes a necessary

²¹⁸ Cf. Ibid., 6-7, 54.

²¹⁹ Like Sun-Ju Kil, Kim does not mention the notion of the federal headship of Adam to his posterity. Also he never mentions a biological or legal relation between them in his sermons.

condition of justification. In this discussion, prayer plays an important role in justification, for it brings in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which is the *seal of righteousness*:

Figuratively speaking of a *seal* [the manifestation of the Holy Spirit] as a mark with which a person can enter the kingdom of God, God teaches that the person who receives the Holy Spirit is His people. It is God's teaching that by this *seal* God distinguishes between His own people and others and protects them, just as we need a seal to distinguish between our goods and others' in order to prevent ours from confusion and to keep them in our custody.²²⁰

Thus, it is the *seal* of righteousness, by which a person is justified in Kim. At this point, a more careful distinction needs to be made between prayer and faith in the "seal" of righteousness. On the one hand, prayer that brings in the baptism of the Holy Spirit functions as a bridge between faith and the imputation of Christ's righteousness.²²¹ On the other hand, Kim says that prayer produces the "inspiration" of the Holy Spirit so that a person can repent to have faith in Jesus Christ.²²² It may simply be that the power of prayer fills in the process of salvation, which leads to the *seal* of righteousness. It actually demolishes the idea of *sola fide–sola gratia* in justification, replacing it with the active power of the will before the act of faith.

Evidently, Kim has in mind that the act of faith is a part of the human response to the gospel through prayer. What he seems to be saying is that if there were no prayer that would produce the baptism of the Holy Spirit, then no imputation of Christ's righteousness

²²⁰ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 53 (italics added). See also *ibid.*, 48-49. For Kim, the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the *seal of righteousness*. Min, *Iljehau*, 313.

²²¹ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 54.

²²² *Ibid.*, 82. We are not going to repeat our discussion of Kim's idea of the loss of faith after believing in Jesus Christ.

would occur. This means that both prayer and the act of faith precede the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, ruling out the sovereign act of God's grace. It has nothing to do with the alien righteousness of the Reformers.

At this point, it is important to recall Kim's conclusion regarding the faith of Abraham that a person can have through repentance.²²³ Furthermore, Kim calls for the strengthening of the human will through simple faith in his sermon "Obedience," advocating the blessing of Abraham:

God says [Deuteronomy 28:1-4] that you who obey will be blessed when you come in and blessed when you go out. Therefore, Abraham became a medium of blessing, for God was with him wherever he went. This is a blessing coming from obedience.... Then, how can you obey? To keep commands. That is, do what God tells you to do, and don't do what He does not tell you to do.... Looking at these cases [Noah, Abraham, Daniel, Daniel's three friends, and Paul], it is not easy to obey, but the blessing that you receive when you obey once is so extraordinary, that is, it is beyond expression in this world.²²⁴

Kim's position in this sermon is not different in significant ways from the notion of Abraham's faith in his sermon "Escape from Weakness and Be Spiritual." Kim relates simple faith to the benefits of simple obedience. He advocates simple faith by repentance. He calls for simple faith by means of obedience.²²⁵ This is a conclusion that is made by confusing justification and sanctification. Kim at this point sees "purity through endless repentance, humility, self-control, and self-denial" as something *helpful* for people to

²²³ Ibid., 82.

²²⁴ Ibid., 65-66.

²²⁵ Cf. Min, *Hankukkidockkyohoesa*, 400.

“eventually stand righteously before God.”²²⁶ This might be called a typical pattern of “Methodist revivalism,” since revivalists, like Ik-Doo Kim, tend to urge people to make decisions in revival meetings.²²⁷ However, the sovereign grace of God in justification has no place to stand for Kim. Rather, Kim emphasizes human consent to God’s call to pray.

Kim has a very strong doctrine of the power of God. This is a major emphasis in his theology. The power of God is “sufficient to lead people into the faith” of the gospel.²²⁸ This divine power also plays a central role in his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is because of the power of the Holy Spirit that the unbeliever repents and knows Jesus Christ; and it is the power of the Holy Spirit by which the unbeliever triumphs over the power of sin:

The wind has power which man cannot see with his eyes. Thus, the wind means the power of the Holy Spirit. A person who receives the baptism of the Holy Spirit has two marvelous powers. First, it is the power with which he gains victory over his sins. It is the power to win over the seven sins. It is the power to destroy the seven tribes of Canaan. It is also the power to gain a victory over the sins not only on the outside but also on the inside. The Holy Spirit is the power to change the soul.²²⁹

It is to this divine power that Kim appeals in his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Such a strong doctrine of the Holy Spirit follows from Kim’s view of the omnipotence of God.²³⁰ If a powerless man draws the power of the Holy Spirit by prayer, then regeneration comes to

²²⁶ Min, *Iljehai*, 311. See also Kim’s sermons “Self-control,” “Love One Another,” “Obedience,” “Escape from Weakness and Be Spiritual,” and “Now Is the Time to Be Alert,” in Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 5-8, 21-33, 64-66, 78-84, 91-94. In his sermons, Kim never really explains how justification and sanctification are different.

²²⁷ Min, *Iljehai*, 312.

²²⁸ *Yijuckmyungjung*, 163. See also *ibid.*, 18, 44, 100, 114, 121, 132, 150.

²²⁹ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 62.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, 48, 51, 52, 59-63.

him.²³¹ Kim therefore insists that the seal of righteousness comes upon him when the power of God brings him a saving faith to gain divine favor in justification. The point of this power of God is crucial to the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness: in his view, one cannot speak of the imputation of Christ's righteousness without recognizing some kind of "power" or capacity for the reception of righteousness. That "power," for Kim, is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and it occurs by human consent, through prayer, to God's work of salvation. To flesh out Kim's view on this matter, let us recall what he says about the Holy Spirit as "power." A passage commented on this idea is worth using here:

The Bible teaches that the Holy Spirit is a *fire*: it is *the power* that removes all indolent disposition by burning it up like a *fire*, and generates us to be eager for serving God and for doing righteous work. Therefore, a fervor found in those who receive the Holy Spirit does not come from human fervor, but from the Holy Spirit.²³²

For Kim, it is impossible for the believer, who has already accepted Jesus Christ as a personal Savior, to have power to receive Christ's imputed righteousness or to be declared just, until the Holy Spirit indwells in him by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, because he is still powerless to receive Christ's righteousness.²³³ Luther believes that the ground of justification is the immediate imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Luther also concludes that once a person is justified by God, the process of sanctification begins necessarily and immediately, although he is not completely sanctified. This is what

²³¹ Kim also uses the term "human inability" in this sense. Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 173. He believes that the word of God has the "power to change" man. The fire baptism of the Holy Spirit also signifies the power of the Spirit. *Ibid.*, 52.

²³² *Ibid* (italics added).

²³³ Also the believer cannot have assurance of salvation until he receives the baptism of the Holy Spirit. *Ibid.*, 48-50.

he calls *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously just and a sinner). For Luther, the power of sin is overcome by the indwelling of the Spirit. However, Kim does not understand that upon regeneration the process of sanctification begins immediately. He also completely omits the concept of God's forensic declaration in justification. Rather, as we have discussed, he is insistent that there is no way in which the will can have sufficient power to gain salvation with its own power without prayer. But, at the same time, freedom of the will still remains, and it is the freedom to choose salvation through prayer. Thus, Kim is willing to emphasize the necessity of prayer in the present state of human inability:

The Bible clearly says, "Examine yourselves to see whether you are in the faith." Don't you know that Jesus Christ is in you or not? Don't you know that the Holy Spirit is in your heart or not? You should pray again and again all the time, not leaving your seat where you started to pray, until you receive the Holy Spirit. When Moody prayed, he said, "Don't give me any more! If the Holy Spirit gives more, I would die," because the Holy Spirit came upon him so much.²³⁴

By presenting an illustration of Moody, Kim means that the power of prayer either brings more assurance or increases the power of the Holy Spirit. By the baptism of the Holy Spirit, man becomes more and more willing to do God's will; his obedience becomes more and more powerful, more passionate in his own heart. The Holy Spirit seals the believer as a righteous one.

Kim's understanding of imputation directly correlates with his understanding of the power of God, which he employs in justification and sanctification. Indeed, Kim speaks of "justification by faith through the baptism of the Holy Spirit alone" as connecting the

²³⁴ Ibid., 49.

believer with Christ's righteousness.²³⁵ He explains, "Jesus Christ is the Head and the church is His body."²³⁶ Kim uses the image of the body. It certainly is the most important image, for "the body of Christ" is the only way that Kim describes union with Christ. However, if Kim's notion of union with Christ is closely interwoven with the baptism of the Holy Spirit, he surely places the imputed act of God with the baptism of the Spirit. It is not that Kim does not see union as rooted in faith; we have seen that he certainly does see the act of faith in justification. But Kim sees union with Christ more distinctively in relation to the baptism of the Spirit or the power of the Spirit than in relation to faith; but faith is a part of the system of justification. Doubtless Kim's use of terms with respect to justification causes great confusion: the fact is that Kim does not have precise definitions of "justification," "imputation," or "union." Kim cannot say precisely how "justification" differs from "sanctification," or how "union" differs from "the baptism of the Holy Spirit." "The power of the Holy Spirit," "the baptism of the Holy Spirit," and "justification by the baptism of the Spirit" are very vague concepts to comprehend in relation to union with Christ.

Another way to look at the problem of Kim's doctrine of imputation is this: the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ in Kim's theology calls us to look to "the power of God" in faith, rather than to Christ. In this way, his doctrine completely eliminates the notion of the exclusiveness of God's grace in justification. For Kim, human beings are to understand that God gives us freedom to choose their eternal destiny through the act of

²³⁵ Ibid., 56.

prayer. As God gives us divine grace through Christ's sacrifice with freedom, the human race is called to the act of prayer in faith.

If we turn now to the crucial issue of the role of Christ, we can see that Kim's tendency is to speak of union with Christ, to whom he refers only as "the Head" of the church.²³⁷ However, Kim never explicitly uses the word "union," or "unity," or "oneness" with Christ in his sermons. If one takes the image of the body, one would think that Kim might vaguely have the concept of union. In fact, Kim's concept of union is completely Christ-centered. For example, in his sermon "The Message of the Cross," Kim speaks of the cross, saying that "The cross is the power." That the cross of Christ is the foundation of our justification is clear in this statement:

If he did not believe in Jesus Christ, he could have been out of his senses. But, he could know there is heaven and hell because he also met the cross. This cross is the power and the blessing to me.... The message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. This power is a power that the world cannot overcome, and a power that overcomes all sins.²³⁸

This statement also makes clear a point that is stressed by Kim: "The baptism of the Holy Spirit is the power."²³⁹ Kim does not characteristically speak explicitly of "the cross" in these statements dealing with the union with Christ. However, he echoes his thought about how the cross of Christ becomes the power of God for salvation. Kim would say that union with Christ takes place in the power of the Holy Spirit by faith in Jesus Christ. But what is

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Ibid., 77.

²³⁹ Ibid., 52.

the nature of imputation in Kim's theology? On what basis does God impute Christ's righteousness to the wicked?

In another place, reflecting on Revelation 3:20, Kim speaks of the image of *nakedness* in relation to salvation:

But there is once you receive the Holy Spirit.... In the end, Revelation 3:20 says, "Here I am! I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with him, and he with me." This means that the Lord will come into the heart of man and eat with him and drink with him, if he realizes that he is blind and naked, and if he repents!²⁴⁰

Kim uses the image of "nakedness" in describing the sins of humanity. This is also used in Kim's discussion of human sin in explaining the necessity of repentance in relation to faith. However, repentance does not result in the *forensic* declaration of justification by God. Kim goes on to explain how we can wear "the white robe" which can cover our "shameful nakedness": "What is the white robe [Revelation 3:18]? God will also sanctify me if a prostitute named Rahab was sanctified and a murderer Moses was sanctified. Let us walk away from our lowly place."²⁴¹ Kim presents here the idea of freedom in the doctrine of faith. In other words, grace gives human beings the possibility of freedom to receive faith, so that they can be covered with the white *robe*. It is important that Kim mentions imputation here: "I hope that you can live with God as you wear *a beautiful, white robe* in having good eyesight after cutting yourself off from sin, and cutting yourself off from *nakedness*."²⁴² The argument seems to be about the covering of man's sins with the white

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 84.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 83.

²⁴² Ibid (italics added).

robe of Christ's righteousness.²⁴³ This is the point of imputation. This covering-up element is found throughout the Old Testament; it originates from the guilt and shame of our first parents.

Does Kim then defend the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness? It does seem to be part of Kim's concern here. However, his theology as a whole makes that uncertain. I doubt that Kim would have thought about the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked in the line of the Reformers, since most of his sermons never mention either union with Adam or union with Christ using the concept of the two federal headships in order to show the solidaric relationships. Typically, he never thinks of them in such "legal" or "forensic" terms. Thus, we should not assume that in Kim's thought a direct correlation between Christ and the believer is included in the notion of union. Kim is primarily interested in the power of God, not in witnessing the primacy of God's grace in justification, not even in his detailed defense of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. From his Arminian viewpoint, Kim sees that the wicked need to be aware of the great power of the will given by God to respond to the gospel.

What is the role of love in the union of the believer with Christ? Kim regards "love" as the "evidence" of the baptism of the Holy Spirit just like the case of the "disciples in the upper room of Mark," and this "true love" consists in "physical love" and "spiritual love."²⁴⁴ This fits together well with his insistence that *true love* is the *physical love* which Jesus had "to have mercy on the sick when He healed the sick," and that the believer must

²⁴³ Ibid., 83.

have *spiritual love* “to heal them,” as the Lord says, “Love your neighbor as yourself.”²⁴⁵ At this point, Kim does not fully specify the nature of love in union with Christ. He does say that “we love the Lord because He loves us,” and he asks, “What is the evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit for the disciples on the day of Pentecost? What is the first fruit of the receiving the Holy Spirit? It is love.”²⁴⁶ Kim’s understanding of the baptism of the Holy Spirit that accompanies love is that it is the empirical act of love, which is the evidence of salvation. Kim also sees the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as we saw, as the power of God, which helps the *true* believer have *true* love, so that the “true” believer “does not sin at all and is actively engaged in sanctified life.”²⁴⁷ For him, it is also the power of God with which the believer can do “righteous works” before God.²⁴⁸

In this account of the doctrine of love, as evidence of a saving faith, Kim echoes “the second blessing revivalism message” or the notion of “the second conversion” in those places where he speaks of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the power of God.²⁴⁹ Similarly, American followers of this second blessing in the nineteenth century were offered the

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 22, 31.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 22-26, 31.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 22, 31.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 62. Kim, as he shows many times in his sermons, again quotes the disciples in the first and second chapters in Acts to explain the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 52.

²⁴⁹ Melvin E. Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996), 19, 229.

promise of “the power and the victory” in Christian life, like John Wesley and Charles Finney, as Melvin Dieter rightly points out:²⁵⁰

The power and the victory promised in the optimism of the holiness message, therefore, may be seen, from this aspect, as a natural and significant consequence of developing revivalism among individuals in whom the principles of perfectionism, Puritanism and pietism were at work.²⁵¹

But does the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Kim’s theology entail perfectionism? One can say that Kim does ascribe some form of perfect status to the believer who is baptized by the Spirit. In criticism of Finney’s concept of the believer’s “change,” Warfield’s analysis of the issue is helpful; “The effect of the change thus brought about is that the sinner ceases to be a sinner, and becomes, at once on the change taking place, perfect.”²⁵² In our analysis, the power of the Holy Spirit in Kim’s theology would be seen in the life of the “true” believer after the baptism of the Spirit, and some capability given by the Spirit would be seen in that the believer always overcomes the power of sin.²⁵³ Overall, it is appropriate to say that Kim’s notion of the believer contains a “perfectionist” element. It should be noted, however, that Kim’s distinctive notion of justification is different from that of Finney.²⁵⁴

²⁵⁰ Dieter, 19, 31, 50. As Finney faced the “second spiritual crisis,” he felt the necessity of the second blessing for “dramatic initial conversion experience.” Ibid., 19, 50.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 5.

²⁵² Benjamin Warfield, *Perfectionism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), 203. Min calls Kim’s theology “evangelical pietism,” since Kim emphasizes such areas as “endless repentance,” “humility,” “self-control,” and “self-denial.” Min, *Iljehai*, 311.

²⁵³ See the characteristics of the regenerate who receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit in Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 54-55.

²⁵⁴ I doubt that one can trace Finney’s views of justification in Kim’s theology, since Finney insists that there are five conditions of justification, such as “the vicarious atonement of Christ,” “repentance,” “faith,” “present sanctification,” and “perseverance in faith and obedience,” while Kim never offers such

Certainly, their theology weakens the notion of *sola gratia* in justification. As for the doctrine of justification, they both stress human responsibility.

To whom is the imputation of Christ's righteousness available? To my knowledge, Kim never uses the word "election," and he broadly supports general atonement by implying in his sermons that the door of salvation is always open: "It is the will of God that by all means He does not want to send even one soul to hell at all"; "Nevertheless Christianity is the truth that in addition to human power a person can go with the power of the Holy Spirit and the merits of the cross just like a man who rides in a train."²⁵⁵ In Kim's view, some people are not specially excluded from salvation, and therefore are not excluded from the imputation of Christ's righteousness. In other words, people are capable of converting and receiving the gift of salvation through the power of prayer by faith.

In conclusion, Kim's doctrine of imputation is simply a theory derived from the power of the will. He makes no claim that the imputation of Christ's righteousness is God's gracious work on the basis of Christ's atonement, nor is it clear that he accepts the concept of union with Christ as taught by the Reformers. There is certainly no reason to see in Kim the primacy of divine grace in the doctrine of imputation. Kim's vagueness on the relationship between Adam and his descendants and the relationship between Christ and believers undoubtedly encourage him to find a strong doctrine of human freedom as his version of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Kim also

conditions for justification in his sermons. Charles Finney, *Finney's Systematic Theology* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1976), 320-38.

²⁵⁵ Ik-Doo Kim, *Sulkyo*, 27, 114. Cf. *Ibid.*, 46, 53, 75, 90.

goes too far in compromising *sola fide*–*sola gratia* with his views on the power of prayer and on the power of God in justification, by failing to bring proper theological concepts into his soteriology as a whole.

Like Sun-Ju Kil, the imputed righteousness of Christ is unclear in the teaching of Ik-Doo Kim. Failing to explain why the cross of Christ becomes powerful, he fails to emphasize the implications of Christ's imputed righteousness in his sermons. Kim also has a tendency to presuppose that for the sake of repentance and salvation, God performs miraculous healings in relation to the power of prayer. In this way, Kim endangers the fundamental Reformed conviction that salvation is gained by the sovereign act of God's grace. Nevertheless, his theology contains a heightened appreciation of God's forgiveness of sins. But the strong impression remains that he believes that all one needs for true knowledge in Christ is the Bible, the Holy Spirit, and prayer.²⁵⁶ The doctrine of justification by faith alone is not clearly found in his theology.

²⁵⁶ Cf. Min, *Iljehaui*, 312.

D. Yong-Do Lee (1901-1933)

In the third period of Korean revival, the teachings of Yong-Do Lee contrast strikingly with those of Sun-Ju Kil and Ik-Doo Kim. It has been argued that Lee's theology is "the suffering Christ" to the point that faith, repentance, and prayer in the Reformed sense play little part in his mystical experience.²⁵⁷ Compared to the abundance of his arguments on "the suffering of Christ" and "union with Christ," Lee's discussions of justification are very rare. When he explains the notion of faith, he often does it in relation to Christ's love and the Christian life rather than justification. Thus, in order to discuss the notion of union with Christ in his doctrine of justification, one must first have an understanding of his ideas of faith and Christ's love. Lee himself uses the concept of justification rather sparingly. In discussing his doctrine of justification, we will examine his views on salvation. The most significant question reflecting Lee's doctrine of justification is, "Does Lee stand in the line of the Reformers in the doctrine of faith?" Having answered this question, we can turn to Lee's thoughts on justification and other issues.

1. The Justification of the Wicked

In what is becoming a debate over the doctrine of faith, some will be amazed that he admires the efforts of the Reformers in the development of the Christian faith—especially the doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of atonement. Basically, Yong-Do Lee criticizes the Korean churches of his day, saying that they should be looking for a "new

²⁵⁷ *Lee Yong-Do Mocksaui Youngsungkwa*, 143-245; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*.

faith” to conquer the world, like the Reformers did in the sixteenth century. Yong-Do Lee calls his age “a dark age of faith.”²⁵⁸

The faith of the Reformers! It became *life* to give them power to conquer the world. The truth advocated by them turned out to be an epoch-making food for man’s spiritual world. But today, human spiritual life needs another new food. We cannot conquer today’s world with the views of the Reformers on *Scripture and atonement*, because the world has changed a lot. Therefore, we need a bomb (the gospel), which fits the ways of today’s world in order for us to conquer it. I believe that it is God’s providence which has brought confusion and unrest upon human souls so that they might desire to catch something more fundamental. We are having a revolutionary epoch in the spiritual world of humankind.²⁵⁹

Does Lee then accept the traditional formula of the Reformers regarding the doctrine of justification by faith alone? Some theologians try to make the case that Lee’s theology is based on the doctrine of justification by faith alone.²⁶⁰ For example, Se-Hyung Lee holds that “Yong-Do Lee lays out his faith on justification by faith alone and sees the process of sanctification as an assignment to the faith of the new era.”²⁶¹ Se-Hyung Lee even says, with somewhat less balance, that Yong-Do Lee believes in “the sanctification of the believer’s personality and faith, which he experiences as change and transformation in the self.”²⁶² In commenting on Romans 1:17, Yong-Do Lee uses the word *faith* to indicate

²⁵⁸ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 127.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 127 (italics added). It is necessary to point out that Lee links the faith of the Reformers to life here. We will discuss this relation later. Also he asserts that he is ready to provide “the gospel (a bomb)” for his age, since he thinks that his age demands a more powerful message than the Reformed doctrines of *sola scriptura* and atonement.

²⁶⁰ Theologians such as Se-Hyung Lee, Jung-Bae Lee, and In-Sick Choi agree on this point. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksaui Yongsungkwa*, 200-203, 212, 221-22, 244.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 202.

²⁶² Se-Hyung Lee thinks that Yong-Do Lee promotes the development of the theology of the Reformers in this sense. *Ibid.*, 202-203.

that the righteous shall live by faith: “The righteous one is a believer who believes God, and faith in God is the motive power, with which he can believe all other things.”²⁶³ Lee’s formulation is that faith is the starting point of the Christian life, which provides “life,” “courage,” and “salvation.”²⁶⁴ There is one aspect of Lee’s doctrine of faith that is crucial in shaping his theology: his preference for the “impartation of Christ’s life” over the “imputation” of Christ’s righteousness or the gift of God’s sovereign *grace* when discussing the relation between faith and the believer.²⁶⁵ The word *faith* in Lee’s theology can pertain to such an idea in relation to regeneration:

He who does not have the remission of sins fears death, and he who does not gain Jesus Christ also fears death. There is only hell to the unbeliever, but there is the open gate of heaven to the believer. Thus, to go to hell or to go to the gate of heaven depends on *the existence of faith*. Faith is to make a vow to the blood and flesh of Jesus Christ. Therefore, to believe is to believe, rely on, and drink the blood of Jesus Christ. We *must believe*, because the blood of Jesus Christ and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit make us live the life of faith.²⁶⁶

Lee sees the possibility of salvation as natural to human nature. Also, Lee wishes to speak of the impartation of Christ’s life to the believer. He conceives of faith primarily in terms of love. In connection with faith, there is an *influx* (impartation) of Christ’s *life*.²⁶⁷

²⁶³ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 13.

²⁶⁴ “Faith and Courage,” in Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 16 [Appendix II]. We will examine this later.

²⁶⁵ Se-Hyung Lee points out that in Yong-Do Lee, Jesus Christ is life, in which we meet Him in us. Se-Hyung Lee calls this “impartation,” not “imputation,” which has nothing to do with “our inner self.” *Yongsungkwa*, 203. I do not believe that Se-Hyung Lee adequately defines either *justification* or *imputation* in his arguments.

²⁶⁶ “Death and Judgment,” in Byun, *Mocksachun*, 23 [Appendix II](italics added).

²⁶⁷ Similarly, Jong-Ho Byun explains that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a “spiritual influx,” using the metaphor of the influx of “dropping eye lotion into one’s eyes,” in Yong-Do Lee’s doctrine of the

Lee does not see faith as important for his doctrine of justification. However, in Lee's argument, faith and love are very closely related in terms of life in justification:

It is impossible to describe strong *feeling* when it [His truth] comes to us by *experiencing* the truth of Jesus Christ just like an electric current flows when two electric wires are connected.... It is for us to have suffering and grief to gain salvation, ... for the love and mercy of Jesus Christ comes to me only through the line of suffering and grief.... How long are you going to struggle hard for being caught up with this world of sin, suffering, and curse? Don't you want to change suffering into joy and hell into heaven by coming into the love of Jesus Christ?²⁶⁸

Through the *line* of faith, the believer is saved by the *input* of Christ's love in the theology of Yong-Do Lee. Faith plays an important role as an instrument, by which the love of Jesus Christ can flow like an *electric current* for Lee. Lee, then, is consistent in maintaining that "love" is "life."²⁶⁹ Thus, a person who has the "love of Christ" has "life," and he who has the life of Christ has "truth."²⁷⁰ In other words, if he knows "God and Jesus Christ," he obtains "eternal life."²⁷¹ With this notion of Christ's love in the instrumental role of faith, Lee teaches his own distinctive doctrine of "divine fellowship."²⁷² In his sermon "The Love of Jesus," Lee strongly insists that the soul is invited to make a crucial decision:

Holy Spirit. Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 194. Thus, the coming of the Holy Spirit is seen as the *influx* of the Holy Spirit in Lee's theology by Jong-Ho Byun, like Se-Hyung Lee.

²⁶⁸ "The Love of Jesus" in Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 52-53 [Appendix II] (italics added).

²⁶⁹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 218; Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 133, 191. Lee also calls life "truth." Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 144.

²⁷⁰ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 14, 144.

²⁷¹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 144.

²⁷² Lee's concept of divine fellowship is crucial to his doctrine of union with Christ. We will look at it more in the next section.

My friends, reject sorrow and grief. If you are oppressed by it, you will see the second death. Live a life of victory, which tramples on it and subdues it.... *Hold* Jesus Christ who saves all those who are burdened. *Come* and *see* Jesus Christ only, and cast aside your heavy burden and leave it up to Him. *Come* to Jesus Christ who invites all those who are burdened, and who makes them find rest.²⁷³

Does this mean that a person is free to respond to the call of the gospel? Lee's answer would be yes. There is "freedom," which belongs to us, and which is another way of describing the "free choice" given through the cross of Christ: "Everyone has *freedom* to enter every place in the temple and pray and obtain blessings *at his own will* since the curtain of the temple was torn in at the moment when Jesus Christ died."²⁷⁴ Even sin does not change this freedom, for by the cross of Christ the door of "freedom" is opened wide to everyone.²⁷⁵ The greatest sin is a "sin that does not believe in Jesus Christ."²⁷⁶ Thus, freedom remains, but it is freedom to choose the life of Jesus Christ. In this sense, we must ask: What is it about the soul that makes free choice its eternal life? In other words, is it related to the act of faith? A closer look at Lee's understanding of faith reveals some interesting elements in the doctrine of justification:

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil converts man into wisdom, and the tree of life converts man into *faith*. The righteous man makes *faith* his *life*, and the worldly man makes wisdom his life. There is *righteousness* in *faith*, and benefit in wisdom. A man of *faith* seeks *righteousness* first, but a man of wisdom seeks benefit first.²⁷⁷

²⁷³ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 53 [Appendix II] (italics added).

²⁷⁴ "A Sermon on the Blood," in Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 56 [Appendix II] (italics added).

²⁷⁵ The doctrine of original sin cannot be found in Lee's theology. He never mentions the sin of Adam either in his sermons or in his letters or in his diary. In this matter he is like Ik-Doo Kim. We will discuss this later.

²⁷⁶ Yong-Do Lee, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Kulmoum* [Collected writings of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee] (Seoul: Dansan Kulbang, 1993), 53.

Lee sees righteousness in relation to the word *life*. How can the word *righteousness* be connected to the word *life* in the doctrine of justification? Unfortunately, Lee apparently has only an incomplete knowledge of the doctrine of justification. This fact, along with the inaccuracy of the notion of righteousness, leads Lee to suggest here that there is *righteousness in faith*.²⁷⁸ But he does not know enough about Christ's righteousness in its relation to faith to define precisely what the meaning of justification is. In short, Lee is mistaken in his view of the relation between faith and righteousness in this instance.

Lee also believes that man can "gain wisdom by human efforts, but can gain faith by God's gift."²⁷⁹ What does he mean by "God's gift"? Can we see a possible link between the doctrine of *sola fide* and the doctrine of *sola gratia* in the line of the Reformers? Lee does not teach the *sola fide-sola gratia* of the Reformers. On the one hand, to Lee *sola fide* is not essential to the gospel. His notion of faith raises the question of human merits for justification, since he sees it in relation to human efforts.²⁸⁰ Therefore, his notion of grace is likewise mixed with some form of human merit. It is not a true "faith alone" of the Reformers, which is formulated without any form of meritorious works.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 69 (italics added). It must be noted here that the "tree of life" signifies the life of Jesus Christ.

²⁷⁸ This example clearly shows how Lee's concept of righteousness can confuse people. He should have said that righteousness comes only from Christ. We will look at some more examples here.

²⁷⁹ Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 69.

²⁸⁰ We will discuss this soon.

If one wants to understand Lee's concept of righteousness and its relation to faith, it is important to recall that Lee regards *life* as *truth*.²⁸¹ Furthermore, for Lee, Jesus Christ is "truth and love, that is, God is truth and love."²⁸² At this point, Lee comes to the following conclusion regarding the redemptive work of God: "God reveals Himself as *righteousness* to some and as *love* to some in order to save them completely, when God reveals Himself to human beings; since on the one hand, God is *righteousness (truth)*, on the other hand, He is *love (grace)*."²⁸³ Surely Lee intends by these statements to help people understand the practical Christian life. Nevertheless, he overemphasizes the link of righteousness to truth, and inaccurate formulations produce theological chaos. This also minimizes the significance of the relation between faith and righteousness. Lee is making the point that a person receives truth when he receives Christ's love or life, and also explaining how "righteousness" comes to him along with truth and life. Thus, there is some ambiguity about the meaning of "righteousness" and its relation to faith. This ambiguity should make Lee reluctant to draw any strong conclusions from these particular discussions. But he preserves the gracious nature of God's love in relation to the life of Jesus Christ by emphasizing conversion *experience*:

Feeling is the work of life; there is *feeling*, if there is life, and vice versa. The knowledge of spirit and the life of spirit are inseparable, for they are the same life. To

²⁸¹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 144.

²⁸² Ibid., 209, 220. Lee seeks to apply a "Jesusism" to his entire soteriology, that is, "Jesus is the way, truth, and life." Ibid., 3; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 127-45.

²⁸³ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 220 (italics added). We can see here that the words *righteousness* and *truth* are used interchangeably by Lee. However, it must be noted here that the term *righteousness* means "divine justice," which reveals God himself in "the ages of man's wickedness" by using "prophets and apostles." Ibid., 220-21.

know God is spiritual life, and spiritual life is to know God. Knowledge is the nature of life or the content of life. Life in the state of knowing God and Jesus Christ! This is eternal life. Therefore, this life is a new life which is received on account of Jesus Christ, and which we originally do not have at all.²⁸⁴

In this statement, Lee is attempting to show the importance of *feeling*, which is crucial in his soteriology. Lee insists that human beings are saved not by works but by the love of God. Then he says that there is no true life without a conversion experience. It is important to note that when Lee discusses salvation, he never speaks of the life of Jesus Christ apart from the relation between regeneration and experience. In his doctrine of regeneration, one cannot speak of the *influx* (impartation) of Christ's life without experiencing some kind of "feeling" or "knowing by feeling" the reception of God's love.²⁸⁵ To Lee, it is impossible to speak of a person's being made just or unjust without him feeling the life of Christ. Lee looks more closely at the functions of the soul by seeing it interact with the freedom of the will. Thus, the soul must feel the *life* of Jesus Christ as it accepts his love.

Throughout this discussion, Yong-Do Lee is reflecting on the nature of faith. Free choice makes a man receive the "love" of Christ, which is "life." It must be noted that with this love of Christ "truth" also comes into the believer through *the line of faith*. In this package of faith, righteousness, by his own definition, also comes to him, for the term *truth*

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 144 (italics added). Lee always overemphasizes experience in explaining the necessity of life in the believer.

²⁸⁵ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 12. Here he also emphasizes the importance of experience in salvation. He speaks of "a feeling of eternal life," with which a person can eternally live. Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 43 [Appendix II].

is used interchangeably with the word *righteousness* in his theology. But if righteousness comes through the line of faith, how can a person have faith?

Lee believes that one must pray to gain faith because prayer is “the one and only way to gain faith.”²⁸⁶ As we have seen, *life* is added to the believer who “gains faith” from God.²⁸⁷ Applied to “freedom,” this means that God gives human beings the opportunity of salvation by obtaining faith through prayer. So the question of faith boils down to the question of how God gives freedom, and yet demands a human decision. On the one hand, Lee sees this apparent need of a human decision in seeking truth:

Let us know the truth! And let us be burnt up with life! Only knowledge is not faith, and life must yet be added to the truth. Let us listen to sermons in order to know the truth. Let us pray to God in order to gain life! Learn the truth in order to know, and believe in Jesus Christ in order to give life to your knowledge.²⁸⁸

Since the wicked need *life* to be saved through the line of faith, Lee’s view of the conversion of the soul is not all that different from his idea of freedom. The wicked cannot have faith by themselves and therefore must ask God to give them faith first so that they can receive life and be saved. In this sense, faith as “God’s gift” comes to the wicked as an answer to their prayer.²⁸⁹ And the *impartation* or the *influx* of Christ’s life occurs through the line of faith. Therefore, although Lee does not explicitly rule out the connection

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 14 [Appendix II].

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 16 [Appendix II].

²⁸⁸ Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 200.

²⁸⁹ Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 69.

between faith and righteousness, he would reject the distinctions of the Reformers regarding divine grace and the imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification.

Yong-Do Lee argues that "the greatest grace" in the Christian life is "to receive the Holy Spirit."²⁹⁰ Lee also describes the grace of the Holy Spirit as follows: "If you want to receive the grace of the Holy Spirit, you must die and come to life again. You can be filled with the new grace after you completely pour out even small sins."²⁹¹ Thus, Lee can speak of repentance, which results in the reception of "the Holy Spirit." Lee argues here that a person must come to life again. But this is not related to the righteousness of Christ. This is not distinguished from the system of freedom, in which Lee includes the reception of "faith" and the reception of "Christ's love."²⁹²

Hold only the Lord! Accept the Lord because no one can save us except Him. Are you ready to accept Him? Did you receive grace? Did you receive the grace of the reception of the Holy Spirit through your preparation to accept the Lord? If so, do not lose the grace with all your might. Do not lose it. Do not forsake the grace even if you are insulted or expelled. It is oil that is received by the preparation of those who will serve the Lord in due time. Pray more and more earnestly. Pray with zeal. *It will be taken away if you do not pray.*²⁹³

Rather than a concern for *sola gratia* in justification, we see here two aspects of Lee's soteriology, which are crucial to the structure of his theology: preparationism and

²⁹⁰ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mochsachun*, 15 [Appendix II].

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁹² Grace and love, as we have seen before, are used synonymously in Lee's theology. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 220.

²⁹³ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 48 (italics added). See also Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 229. Lee often includes some other senses of grace, such as giving us things like "fish," the reception of the "Holy Spirit," and "sufferings" in the Christian life. In other words, Lee does not draw a clear line between saving grace and sanctifying grace. Jong-Ho Byun, *Mochsachun*, 57 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 229, 117.

loss of grace. This formulation helps us to see that to affirm the doctrine of freedom to choose eternal life is to affirm the doctrine of prayer and indeed to affirm the whole, for all doctrines are interdependent. Lee puts himself in opposition to the teachings of the Reformers, if he means that the work of regeneration is not immediate but gradual. In Lee's view, as we have seen before, one cannot speak of the *influx* (impartation) of life without recognizing some kind of *opportunity* for the reception of grace. That opportunity of "freedom," for Lee, is the capacity or the ability to prepare oneself for salvation, and its role is nothing more than a consent to the gospel. At this point, it is plain that Lee does not hesitate to stress human ability in justification. Indeed, his strong emphasis on human cooperation over God's sovereign grace in justification opens the door to the loss of grace: you can lose grace that is "the reception of the Holy Spirit," if you do not "pray."

Instead of emphasizing the exclusiveness of God's sovereign grace in justification, Lee indicates that human efforts are the necessary condition for justification. His doctrine of justification holds that after the Fall, human ability remains and is rendered potent by the cross of Christ. Lee also asserts that fallen men can stand before God's eyes, and salvation is placed within their power by the exercise of the will through prayer. Thus, he defends works-righteousness in justification. As far as faith is concerned, Lee comments on Roman 1:17:

The righteous shall live by faith (Romans 1:17). Not only the righteous but also all people shall live by faith. Students can learn when they have faith in teachers, and husband and wife can manage their home when they have faith. A righteous person believes in God, and faith in God is the driving force that helps him have faith to

believe all other things. How can I live without believing myself, since I can believe myself when I believe in God?²⁹⁴

It would almost seem from this that the “faith” in justification is the same thing as a student’s faith in a teacher or husband’s faith in his wife. If so, Lee completely departs from the concept of faith in the theology of the Reformers, who taught justification by grace alone through faith alone because of the imputed merit of Christ alone. Lee’s view of faith provides a weak basis for the doctrine of justification. Justification by faith alone is meaningless to him as long as he is not willing to give a clear definition of faith in relation to the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers.²⁹⁵ And since Lee excludes *sola fide* from justification in Romans 1:17, we can be sure that his formulation of the doctrine of justification is very ambiguous, and we should regard him as inconsistent with his own doctrine. This kind of formulation has some significant consequences. On this view of faith, Lee sets forth *four ages*, and among them the age of faith is the third age:

Age of faith: People cannot be saved as sinners even if they lead an ascetic life. They will be greatly disappointed when they realize that they can be saved only if they are *holy and pure*. Thus, this is an age when *people are justified by faith alone*, not by seeking after truth. Paul is a representative.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

²⁹⁵ For Lee, there was “grace” when Jesus was moved by “love,” and there was “truth” when he was moved by “righteousness.” At this point, there is no doubt that Lee separates the use of righteousness from that of grace. Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 154.

²⁹⁶ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 141 (italics added). There are three more ages, and there are representatives for each age: “1. Age of the church: It is an age when people observe rituals and obey rules in the church. Peter is a representative. 2. Age of asceticism: It is an age when people try to achieve truth by casting out sins, mortifying the flesh, and practicing asceticism, because they cannot escape from sin by keeping church rituals and by obeying rules. Jacob is a representative.... 4. Age of love: People are dissatisfied with faith because they realize that they have no love.” It seems to me that these four ages are meant to be the four phases of faith in the Christian life. Ibid.

At this point, justification by faith alone, if Lee has a clear concept of faith, should be described only in terms of God's sovereign grace.²⁹⁷ There is, evidently, no divine grace in Lee's view of justification. He is really referring to "faith in love" rather than to "faith alone" in justification.²⁹⁸ Lee's intent here is that love should be taken as the prime goal of Christian life, but that undermines the foundation of forensic justification because there is no clear idea of the necessity of Christ's *righteousness* for the wicked.

Lee never defines the doctrine of justification clearly; rather, he uses the term broadly to describe the *influx* or *impartation* of Christ's "life" or "love" or "truth" to the wicked.²⁹⁹ However, this view contradicts the teaching of the Reformers that God's sovereign grace in Jesus Christ, which is the content of faith, precedes faith in justification. Indeed, Lee himself insists that in the *ordo salutis* the act of prayer goes before God's imputation of Christ's righteousness.

Being in possession of "freedom" or "the power of the will," the wicked are able to trust the life of Christ in God's work within us, at least in their obvious experiences.³⁰⁰ Lee

²⁹⁷ Notice that for the sense of righteousness Lee uses the expression "holy and pure" for the justification of the wicked.

²⁹⁸ This statement reflects Lee's emphasis on the love of Christ again. There is no mention of righteousness. He just suggests that people are justified by faith without explaining the necessity of Christ's righteousness. *Ibid.*, 141-42.

²⁹⁹ On this view of justification, as Lee often suggests, it would also seem that a person is justified by truth. And truth comes to him as he prays to God.

³⁰⁰ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 17, 43 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 144; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 12, 58-59. See also the testimony of Victor Wellington Peters in *Lee Yong-Do Mocksaui Yongsungkwa*, 26, 91, 98, 195 (the experience of the cross); In-Soo Kim, 426 (mysticism based on personal experience). For Lee's experience-centered theology, see Dong-Sick Yoo, 163; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 111, 232, 330; Min, *Iljehaui*, 383, 191; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 203; Sung-Sick Seo, "Lee Yong-Do Shinhacksasangae Daehan Yucksa Shinhackjuck Kochal [A historical-theological study on the theology of

subscribes to a synergistic doctrine of justification because he urges people to trust in human works, explaining that the life of Christ can be experienced by faith, rather than emphasizing the work of God for their justification since they are unrighteous sinners. Lee implies that the ability to gain divine favor remains in humanity after the Fall.

This experiential theology encourages Yong-Do Lee to distinguish sharply between *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*. At this point, Lee disregards the idea of *sola scriptura* of the Reformers that the Scripture is the only binding source of absolute authority: it must rule all areas of human knowledge, including the doctrine of justification.³⁰¹ In other words, *saving faith* in justification must have content, which does not come from human experiences, but must come only from the Bible. The message of Scripture for human beings is a message of grace from God, who is absolutely sovereign in justification. Thus, the emphasis on experience in justification cannot keep people from false teachings, for if a human experience is necessary for proper truth, then that human experience becomes the ultimate authority in the doctrine of justification.

Yong-Do Lee in light of Luther, Bernard, and Wesley]" (Th.M. thesis, Korea Methodist Theological Seminary, 1998), 19, 34. On the basis of this experiential theology, Lee severely attacks traditional confessions and doctrines. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 161, 222; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 25, 103; Yong-Do, Lee, *Kulmoum*, 102. Lee is also somehow influenced by Sandah Singh and Immanuel Swedenborg. For Sanda Singh, see Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 13; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 135, 194; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 44; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 139, 140; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 432. For Immanuel Swedenborg, see Jong-Ho Byun, *Seokwanjip*, 133; Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 102; In-Soo Kim, *History*, 432; Yong-Hun Lee, *The History of the Korean Church* (Seoul: Concordia Press, 1978), 186; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 142-43, 188.

³⁰¹ The emphasis on *sola scriptura* is not found in the teachings of Yong-Do Lee presented by Jong-Ho Byun. Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 127-51. Cf. John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1987), 169-214. Certainly, Lee tends to reject the *sola scriptura* of the Reformers. *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 157-16; Min, *Hankukkidokkyohoeosa*, 437; Min, *Iljehau*, 391; Kyung-Bae Min, *Kyohoea Minjok* [The church and the nation] (Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1981), 303; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 196, 208; Yong-Hun Lee, *History*, 186.

In conclusion, Lee makes some serious theological errors in his doctrine of justification. Faith comes through prayer and righteousness becomes ours through the work of faith in his theology. He does not adequately prove how a person is justified by faith alone in the line of the Reformers. Many of his actual arguments, which are deeply rooted in his own personal experiences, are quite inconsistent with his own doctrines in his overall doctrine of justification. This causes a radical break between his theology and the views of the Reformers. Certainly, Lee's doctrine of justification is defective in its view of *sola fide*—*sola gratia* and in the relation between *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*, because Lee's ideas in justification are essentially experience-centered. Again, it is insufficient for Lee to insist that a person is justified by faith with his experience-centered theology. As we have seen, Lee does not teach that one is justified by God's sovereign grace alone through faith alone because of Christ's imputed righteousness alone.

2. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

To complete our analysis of Yong-Do Lee's doctrine of justification, we should discuss his response to the doctrine of imputation. We have discussed his response to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which is centered on feeling and experience. We have also discussed some details of his views of faith and righteousness, which lie deep in human freedom. Lee also discusses many other relations between faith and life, and love and life in the doctrine of justification. We now come to the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Here is, at last, his actual argument—his doctrine of union with Christ. Does Lee see union with Christ in the relationship between Christ and the believer? The

seriousness of this question leads us into another question: How does Lee approach it and understand this relationship? In this section we shall consider some examples of Lee's actual arguments, seeking to understand how he elucidates his doctrine of union. Here we shall look at the arguments that Lee considers important in the correlation of the two unions, Adamic and Christological. Does he teach that humanity inherits the first sin of Adam? How does he explain the union of Adam and his descendants?

Lee uses various phrases to describe the relation between Adam and his descendants. In his diary, he speaks of "the corruption of humanity," a phrase derived from his doctrine of original sin. This phrase suggests to Lee a combination of death and life, with a primacy of life over all other areas in his theology.³⁰² In this diary, Lee states that the status of humanity has been changed from "spirit to flesh," from "faith to doubt," from "feeling to knowledge," and from "goodness to wickedness," because Adam and Eve chose the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil."³⁰³ In another place, Lee tries to connect the first sin of Adam with his descendants:

Have mercy on me, O God, according to your unfailing love; blot out my transgressions. Wash away all my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin. For I know my transgression, and my sin is always before me. Look, I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me.³⁰⁴

³⁰² Lee also insists here that we "cannot obtain life" with "knowledge" due to our corruption. This statement comes from Lee's comment on the third chapter of Genesis. As we have discussed in the previous section, it reminds us of the primacy of Christ's life to the believer in Lee's doctrine of justification. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 98.

³⁰³ Ibid.; Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 14 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 85.

³⁰⁴ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 50.

The theme of sinfulness is a strong one in Lee, which comes to expression largely in his discussion of the status of humanity. What kind of relation between Adam and his posterity can be found in the sin of the first parents? Does he believe that the first sin of Adam is transferred to his posterity? In his diary, Lee asserts that God “separated” himself from Adam due to his sin.³⁰⁵ Lee admits in many places that humanity has a sinful nature.³⁰⁶ Nonetheless, he never teaches the solidarity between Adam and his posterity in terms of *realism* or *federalism*.³⁰⁷ Rather, in his sermon “Death and Judgment,” Lee points out that the “sin of a father” is transferred to “his children”:

Sin has not only a *chronic nature* but also a *hereditary nature*. Sin is passed on to one’s children due to a criminal act of a father like syphilis is transmitted to his children.... Death is the last classroom and school. If the wicked do not repent even at the very moment when they approach their death, they volunteer for penal servitude for life. A lifer in this world can be once released from prison, but a true penal servitude for life is endless.³⁰⁸

This statement is crucial to the understanding of Lee’s notion of original sin. Lee does not see solidaric union in the relationship between Adam and his posterity.³⁰⁹ Lee never teaches that Adam is the head of the whole human race, “seminally” or “representatively.” There is no conception of *oneness* between Adam and his posterity in

³⁰⁵ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 98.

³⁰⁶ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 14, 19-20, 32-3, 44, 69 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 12, 84, 90-3, 96, 105-6, 152, 172; Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 32; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 20-22, 50, 54, 59, 101; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Baseki*, 29, 196, 239; Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 53.

³⁰⁷ Cf. G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics: Sin* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977), 436-465.

³⁰⁸ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 22 [Appendix II] (*italics added*).

³⁰⁹ Cf. John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam’s Sin* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1959), 24-41; Berkouwer, *Sin*, 436-65.

Lee's theology. Then what is the nature of Adamic union for Lee? Although some of his expressions suggest the hereditary nature of sin, there is no clear-cut evidence in these statements that he believes in the union of humanity in the sin of Adam. In other words, the whole human race does not participate in the first sin of Adam through solidaric union between them. By using the metaphor of a "disease," Lee maintains that it is not the imputation of Adam's first sin to the whole human race, but the transfer of the sin of "a father to his children" from generation to generation. The consequence of Adam's apostasy is transferred to us in some form of *propagation*, since Lee does not see the whole human race in Adam.³¹⁰ Thus, there is no imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants as in the view of Augustine or the Reformers. Imputation does occur, but it is the imputation of the guilt of one's father to oneself.

Lee evidently wants to emphasize the forensic character of divine justice, and to distinguish a "court of death" from a "court of judgment": "the first court is the court of death and the second the court of judgment."³¹¹ How is this argument to be presented in a concrete forensic fashion? Lee answers that everyone will be judged according to their deeds:

If your hands are used for righteous works, it will be written in a declaration for heaven. If they are used for unrighteous works, it will be written in a declaration for hell. Everyone knows whether he has righteous hands [deeds] or unrighteous hands [deeds], even if he is very illiterate. He who has good hands will participate in eternal blessings, but he who has evil hands will face eternal punishment.³¹²

³¹⁰ In other words, there is imputation from the ancestors to the descendants themselves in Lee's theology. Cf. Berkouwer, *Sin*, 436-48; Murray, *Imputation*, 24-36.

³¹¹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 19 [Appendix II].

³¹² *Ibid.*

Certainly, Lee is aware of the necessity of Christ's atonement since the wicked will face God's "punishment." Lee also includes the Reformers' language of divine justice.³¹³ In another place, Lee speaks of a legal declaration by which God declares a person just.³¹⁴ For Lee, God both "makes" a person "just" and "declares [him] just."³¹⁵ However, for Lee the declaration of justice follows a human decision based on freedom, as we have seen before. Thus, justification is a declaratory act of God that takes into account works-righteousness through prayer. That is to say, Lee does not follow the teaching of the Reformers, in which a judicial and declaratory act of God follows the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Lee's view presupposes that righteousness is based on human response to the gospel. It denies the true imputation of Christ's righteousness. It is for this reason that the Reformers speak of *extra nos* ("outside of or apart from us"). Again, the *extra* righteousness is imputed to the wicked in the eyes of God by faith for the Reformers.³¹⁶

Lee cites several biblical quotations in support of his view of justification. It appears that he is echoing the teaching of Luther and Calvin. He affirms the necessity of

³¹³ For Lee, justification must be based on the atonement of Christ because "no one is righteous." Ibid., 20-21.

³¹⁴ Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 36. This is derived from Lee's letter to Kwang-Woo Kim on October 11, 1930.

³¹⁵ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 68-69 [Appendix II]. Lee repeats that Jesus Christ "makes a sinner just."

³¹⁶ Sproul, *Faith*, 106-107.

Christ's atonement for a person to be justified, and he speaks of the great blessing of justification:

As Romans 3:10 says, "There is no one righteous, not even one" in this world. Indeed, it is a profound truth and miracle that the forgiveness of Jesus Christ makes all the people just. All the people who commit large and small sins can be forgiven by faith alone. How great and extraordinary that fact of blessing is!³¹⁷

However, in his sermon "The True Christian," Lee seems to depart from the thought of the Reformers. He declares that "a true faith arises from the *experience* of remissions.... It can be called a true faith when a person goes up the stair that gains forgiveness."³¹⁸ When Lee expands on this point, he means that what is begun in regeneration must be experienced in the process of salvation. If regeneration does not *actually* occur through human experience, then it cannot be called a "truth faith." For example, the proof of regeneration, which occurs at the beginning of conversion, is a work of human experience, which follows salvation by works-righteousness. What is shocking here is Lee's statement that regeneration is not completed in one moment. Perhaps Lee intends to argue that the life of Christ must be an ongoing experience in the Christian life. However, his statement clearly shows that his theological ideas are deeply rooted in an experience-centered theology.

It is this theory of forgiveness and experience that causes Lee to describe justification as he does. This does not mean that Lee completely ignores the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Rather, his view of justification is synergistic in that God

³¹⁷ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 21 [Appendix II]. Here he clearly argues that no one can escape "the sword of God's punishment."

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 17 (italics added).

declares a person to be just when the ground for justification is found in the person through the act of faith. At this point, it must be mentioned that Lee's doctrine of faith turns out to play the role of a *cooperative* instrument in justification. In this sense, God sees human decision to be the ground for justification. Lee maintains that a person can obtain righteousness through seeking God's favor. The key to understanding Lee's view of justification is to keep in mind that some parallels exist between this theory of human experience in justification and the idea of the cross of Christ, by which Jesus Christ is considered the only joy with whom to have fellowship. The "suffering Christ" plays an important role in the mystical experience of the believer.³¹⁹

All the beautiful character of Jesus Christ is centered on His cross. And it is centered on His blood. When we look at it—when we look at His divine personality—we realize our sins. And we can walk away from our sins. We can cut sins that are caused by our sinful nature and lustful sins. Afterwards the Holy Spirit always dwells in our hearts.... He was horribly killed for our sins. He was mocked in various ways. He was crowned with a crown of thorns. People did not nail the righteous Jesus on the cross with their hands, but sins nailed the Lord. He had no reason to come to the world if there were no sins. He fought a fight for our sins and was killed because of our sins. He died on behalf of our sins. He shed His blood for our death.³²⁰

Lee makes it clear on several occasions that the cross of Christ is vicarious, providing the ground for forgiveness.³²¹ The Son bears for his people sins that are transferred to him. Are we justified by the *imputed* righteousness of Christ? On this subject,

³¹⁹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 117. In relation to the cross of Christ, Lee calls suffering "my teacher."

³²⁰ The cross of Jesus Christ is the center of Yong-Do Lee's theology. See Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 20-21.

³²¹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 15, 23, 50, 54-55 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 163, 191; Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 53, 112, 218, 225-26, 229, 230; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 138, 147; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 20, 58-59, 60.

Lee does not explicitly use the terms *imputation* and *transfer*. Nevertheless, it is important to see that the idea of transferred punishment is the very heart of Lee's theology.³²² And it should be noted that Lee links the cross of Christ to a "spiritual movement." In the Reformed tradition, he encounters a strong 'dualism' that remains basic to his own theology.³²³ He sees the human spirit as a superior part of the human body, which must struggle throughout life to lift itself with the "mystical work of the Holy Spirit."³²⁴ For Lee, the cross of Christ initiates a process that makes the believer want to "imitate" Jesus Christ as much as possible throughout his Christian life:

A theological stream of modern Christian theology has certainly separated Christians, sinners, from Christ, by insisting that they cannot *imitate* Jesus Christ. Externally, the life of Jesus Christ is very simple.... Therefore, you have to *touch* a part of the inner movement of Christ, the lively motion of His Spirit, in order for us to know the life of Jesus Christ, because it [His external expression] will be short of knowledge. Then my whole life gets affected by the electric light of [His] love or the spiritual voice of [His] love, which is produced by a *contact between His Spirit and my spirit*.³²⁵

By describing the spiritual power of the Holy Spirit as a fundamental source of the Christian life, Lee evidently wants to distinguish his theology from the theological approaches of the Reformers and the theories of his predecessors such as Sun-Ju Kil and Ik-

³²² Cf. Lee's sermon, "Death and Punishment," in Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 18-23; 6:20-21 [Appendix II].

³²³ Min, *Iljehai*, 349-57; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 201-208.

³²⁴ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 15, 23, 51 [Appendix II]; Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 43, 59, 81-2; Jong-Ho Byun, *Samooohshipyon*, 195; Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 72, 103, 270-71; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 20, 32, 62, 97, 104; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 101, 108, 122, 130; Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 47, 208.

³²⁵ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 25 (italics added). Yong-Do Lee emphasizes spiritual "fellowship" with Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. This statement also shows an element of experience. See also *ibid.*, 87.

Doo Kim: all things become genuine matters of spirituality. Lee absolutely affirms the necessity of a “contact between the Holy Spirit and my spirit.” At this point, it is important to note that in discussing union, Lee also emphasizes this *contact* in relation to participation.³²⁶

The participation of the suffering Christ on the cross is crucial to Lee’s understanding of union with Christ, for participation and union are very closely related to each other in his theology. On one occasion, Lee speaks of his own conversion and spiritual experience, when he fought “the devil” and heard “the voice of God” after praying to God.³²⁷ This experience must have had a major impact on his thoughts at the beginning of his Christian life, and it eventually found expression in his view of *participation* in his theology. Lee makes it clear that only those who seek Jesus Christ will be led to *experience* the life of Christ shown on the cross:

This life comes from a *contact* with Jesus Christ. The grace of life comes from Jesus Christ. You must cling to Jesus Christ. If you want to cling to Jesus Christ, you must remove iniquities in you.... *Reach out* the hands of your spirit and *touch* even a part of Jesus Christ. You can receive the life, if you can *touch* even only a part of Jesus Christ because the blood, the life, and the *existence* of Jesus Christ are the blood and the life of love, holiness, power, peace, sacrifice, and service.³²⁸

Clearly, Lee means to teach here that Christ-centered faith is important. An act of faith in Jesus Christ draws the *life* to overcome the flesh’s bondage to sin, and brings the

³²⁶ We will discuss this union later.

³²⁷ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 24-37.

³²⁸ Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 73-74 (italics added). Jesus Christ is the center of Christian life for Lee: “Jesus Christ! The focus of our faith is Jesus Christ! Only Jesus Christ is our hope and our patience. Only Jesus Christ is also prayer and praise.... Only Jesus Christ is the pivot of our Christian life.” Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 157-58.

believer to participate in the suffering Christ: we “follow only Jesus Christ who died on the cross” and “our work will be completed when a drop of our blood runs.”³²⁹ For Lee, the cross of Jesus Christ is not the object for contemplation but the object of experience, something aimed at as the final goal in the Christian life. It is precisely this participation that is called “the participation of the suffering Christ.”³³⁰ This participation relies on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the believer.³³¹ And the doctrine of participation rests on the presumption that the believer can participate in the fullness of life that is in Jesus Christ when he has a similar “suffering of Christ” in this world.³³² Such believers experience the “glory” of which the cross of Jesus Christ is the source.³³³ The final goal of this participation is achieved by being *united* in the suffering of Christ:

I [Yong-Do Lee] am cursed. I am cursed for these people. My cursed eyes are full of tears. I shed tears that they must shed. I feel pain in my cursed heart.... My blood dries up because of them, and my flesh trembles. Oh, brethren, drink my blood. But how long will you drink it? Oh, brethren, eat my flesh. But how long will you eat it? Eat, drink, and live since I have come for you.³³⁴

Lee finally develops the notion of *oneness* with Christ, which replicates the suffering of Christ on the cross. Here Lee also comes down on the side of experience. In

³²⁹ Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 92. Lee believes that the more a person takes his own cross to participate in the suffering Christ, the better he can be *united* with the love of Christ. It should also be noted here that he regards love as life. Cf. Min, *Kyohoesa*, 294, 300; Dong-Sick Yoo, *History*, 147; Lee Yong-Doui *Sangae*, 170, 294, 300.

³³⁰ Jong-Ho Byun, *Samoohshipyon*, 331.

³³¹ Lee also insists that we should “die in the Holy Spirit.” Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Sashipyon*, 135.

³³² Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 72.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 66.

order for a believer to become one with Christ, sufferings in the Christian life becomes an important element of *experience* in his “theology of the cross.”³³⁵ Often it is called a “theology of participation.”³³⁶ Lee regards the participation of the suffering Christ to be something more than an offer of participation for the believer or some other invitation to imitate Christ’s life. Lee sees this participation as a spiritual contact to become *one* with Christ. And this “oneness” with Christ becomes the prime goal of the Christian life. Certainly it has an element of the gospel, but Lee teaches a doctrine of “divine fellowship,” one of his most attractive teachings for his hopeless people.³³⁷ Through divine fellowship with Christ, the mind receives divine power to obtain *life*. For example, Lee explains the theory of *divine fellowship* with Christ in terms of a “principle of oneness”:

I am swallowed up by the love of the Lord, and He is swallowed by my faith. That is, I am in His love and He is in my faith. Ah, how profound it is! *A principle of oneness....* Life is truth. This is *sense*, not by study but by *feeling*. To *sense* through *feeling* is the best way to sense a thing.... To know the spirit world, and to know God. It cannot be done by study through the brain, but by *spiritual feeling*. *Feeling* is a work of life, that is, there is *feeling* because there is life. Spiritual knowledge and life cannot be separated from each other. They are the same life. To know God is spiritual life, and vice versa.³³⁸

Lee’s notion of *oneness* with Christ is the key idea in his views on *unio mystica* (mystical union).³³⁹ This might be interpreted as a kind of sanctification on Lee’s part.

³³⁵ Lee Yong-Doui *Sangae*, 37.

³³⁶ Or it is called a “liberation theology.” Lee Yong-Doui *Youngsungkwa*, 143, 150, 158.

³³⁷ Lee Yong-Doui *Sangae*, 188.

³³⁸ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 12-13 (italics added).

³³⁹ It is important to recall that Lee does not draw a clear line between justification and sanctification. This causes a great deal of confusion in his soteriology.

Indeed, it is precisely the kind of statement that Kyung-Bae Min points out as an example of what makes Lee's mysticism unacceptable.³⁴⁰ However, it is clear that in the notion of *unio mystica* Lee never wishes to speak of justification by the imputed merit of Christ alone. This special grace of God called *union mystica* has nothing to do with the righteousness of Christ. The first thing to note here is that Lee does not present us with an actual relationship between Jesus Christ as the federal Head and the believer. He states how the believer actually *experiences* the life of Jesus Christ through fellowship between Christ and the believer. But this gives us, not a specific argument about union with Christ for the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, but a set of conditions under which the regenerate might obtain the power of the life of Jesus Christ through the *experience* of *oneness*. This argument would depend on oneness with Christ by faith in the regenerate. The important presupposition behind this theory of *oneness* with Christ is that nothing has been developed in the doctrine of justification by faith alone because of Christ alone. Rather, Lee's argument is motivated by an assumption of his theology of experience.

Why does Lee insist so strongly on restricting *unio mystica* to a *principle of oneness* in terms of the *participation* of the suffering Christ, and ignoring the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Probably because Lee believes that after the experience of *fellowship* with Christ, believers cannot help but be transformed to a higher degree of the love of Jesus Christ, for they will be led to *experience* God's love and power demonstrated in the suffering of Christ. He believes that a *double exchange of life* occurs between "the

³⁴⁰ Min, *Iljehai*, 349, 382-88, 391. Sung-Kuh Chung also sees mysticism as a weakness in Lee's theology. Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 201-4.

life of Jesus Christ” and “the life of wickedness”; then the soul can be filled with the life of Jesus Christ.³⁴¹ For him, *oneness* with Christ is the ground for a *double exchange* of life. Upon this foundation, Lee discusses the relation between faith and life in justification in a letter to Kyo-Soon Kim.³⁴² In it, he is attempting to define *faith* in terms of *life* and *righteousness*. He insists that “faith is the work of a double exchange of life.”³⁴³ Faith takes in the Christian life. By this *double exchange of life*, “a life of sin is exchanged for the life of Jesus Christ, who lives in heaven.”³⁴⁴ The concept of this double exchange of life is one of the most significant ideas in Lee’s theology, and it is the element in his thought that brings his soteriology together. On the basis of the double exchange of life, Lee maintains that human beings can gain righteousness:

Christian life is to exchange life for life. A person believes, but has no exchange of life! Then, he lives in death still. We find *unrighteousness* in our life without ceasing, rush to Jesus Christ, and exchange it for *the righteousness of life*, and then come back with it. And this can be done while we are praying. If *this double exchange of life* does not occur while in prayer, its labor is for nothing at all.³⁴⁵

What is most striking about Lee’s notion of *righteousness* is that he constantly insists that the believer still seeks to gain righteousness in the Christian life. He speaks of some *righteousness* as being “exchanged” or “gained” by prayer. With this point, he stresses a

³⁴¹ He says, “The life of my wickedness living in this world is exchanged for the life of Jesus Christ, who lives in heaven; my life that desires material gain is exchanged with His life that desires spiritual things; my life that makes efforts in anxiety and worry is changed into His life that jumps up with joy, peace, and courage.” Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 87.

³⁴² Lee wrote this letter on November 14, 1931. Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 112-15.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, 112.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 113 (italics added).

logical relationship between justification and sanctification with the term *righteousness*. As Lee says in one place, a person “realizes” his “*unrighteousness* and find *righteousness* in Jesus Christ.”³⁴⁶ In his notion of righteousness, Lee seeks to describe concretely how righteousness becomes one’s own. If one does not pray, then righteousness does not come to him at all. Lee never calls “righteousness” “the righteousness of Christ.”³⁴⁷ Rather, he describes it as “the righteousness of life.” With his concept of righteousness, Lee absolutely denies the Reformers’ notion of righteousness in forensic justification. Furthermore, with his distinctive idea of a double exchange of life, an important problem emerges at this point. Although Lee affirms the necessity of righteousness, he nevertheless often writes as if the believer can increase or decrease his righteousness by his own efforts, and thus the status of righteousness can be affected by human effort through prayer.³⁴⁸

Lee’s teaching of this *double exchange of life* does not necessarily begin with the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the wicked as taught by the Reformers. That is, he is not teaching that there is the *double transfer* of our sin to Christ and Christ’s righteousness to us in salvation. Lee goes on to argue for the necessity of *participation* in the life of Christ by human effort, which is contrary to the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Such an argument makes the same mistake that Sun-Ju Kil and Ik-Doo Kim commit

³⁴⁶ Jong-Ho Byun, *Mocksachun*, 42 [Appendix II] (italics added).

³⁴⁷ In one place, he describes the Lord as “righteousness,” but it actually means “truth.” Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 34. It is necessary to recall that he often speaks of truth as life. Cf. *Ibid.*, 13-14.

³⁴⁸ Anthony Hoekema severely criticizes the Tridentine notion that justification can be “lost” or “increased.” Anthony A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1994), 164-65.

by subscribing to synergistic justification: they stress human freedom or responsibility rather than the exclusiveness of God's grace in justification.

What is the highest degree of love that describes the mystical union? Lee uses the image of spiritual marriage. It is the primary metaphor to describe union with Christ for him. Several references to spiritual marriage, for example, can be found in some other places. Reflecting on the cross, Lee states:

Sister, you are the Lord's bride forever. He takes you in marriage, that is, He does that by the payment of [His] tears and blood. The cross is His monument of victory, which will exist forever.... And look for Him as far as the inner palace of His deep love. It is the inner sanctuary of love, a place from which you are unable to come out once you enter. Then your eyes will hug the true character of the Lord from there.... You, like the tents of Kedar, will shine with beauty like the tent curtains of Solomon; and the Lord, who is inside of the tent curtains, will sing a song for love.³⁴⁹

This statement contains a number of important elements in Lee's concept of union. It stresses that the union is a spiritual one with the will of the believer. This corresponds to the stress on human freedom in Lee, which we have seen throughout this study. However, Lee is reluctant to include the *double exchange* of the essence of Jesus Christ, like Andreas Osiander who is severely criticized by John Calvin.³⁵⁰ In this image of marriage for the spiritual union, Lee also suggests that the substance of humanity does not change, although

³⁴⁹ Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 133. Cf. *Ibid.*, 99; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 31; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 35. Jong-Soo Park points out that Lee likes to identify himself with the woman in the Song of Songs. *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 164. Thus, Lee is an ardent admirer of the Song of Songs. It is said that Lee falls into the *experience of oneness* with Christ whenever he reads the Song of Songs. *Ibid.*, 165. Park thinks that *oneness* with Christ is Lee's distinctive mysticism. *Ibid.*, 166-72.

³⁵⁰ The divine nature of Christ is substituted for Christ's righteousness by Osiander in the doctrine of imputation, as we saw in the third chapter of this dissertation. Cf. Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), 3.11.5-10. For Lee, it is the *life* of Jesus Christ that is exchanged for the life of the believer, not the exchange of the essence of Christ's nature.

it is transformed by the experience of the love of Christ. Furthermore, Lee sees a limit to human freedom in dealing with union with Christ, and affirms that the experience of this union with Christ in love is God's work, although a person approaches with his freedom. For the reception of Christ's love, Lee insists that God is transforming the believer. He makes it clear that what is experienced as "spiritual fellowship" is in fact a mutual relationship.³⁵¹ However, what is clear is that God responds to an act of faith through prayer to share an experience of his love with the bride. In another place, Lee makes a similar suggestion about the nature of the love relationship: "Oh! The bride whom the Lord loves, and His fervent servant. Now, rest up, and hope in the Lord, and never try to be something by yourself."³⁵² Lee eventually speaks of *a principle of oneness*, which shows a perfectly mutual relationship between the Lord and the bride.³⁵³

A further element of *unio mystica* in Lee is that the experience of union with Christ in our present existence has the final goal of "perfection."³⁵⁴ In other words, Lee uses the

³⁵¹ Lee urges people to pray for this *spiritual fellowship* with Christ. Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 86-87.

³⁵² Yong-Do Lee, *Kulmoum*, 86-87.

³⁵³ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 12.

³⁵⁴ Lee insists that the moment of *perfection* comes when a person himself totally "dies" [self-denial]. Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*, 92; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 68-83. Lee speaks of the following stages of the believer: (1) to know the Lord, (2) the dwelling of the Holy Spirit, (3) the self in the dwelling of the Lord, (4) doing what the Lord did, (5) *perfection*. Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 32. Lee shows here that the stage of *perfection* is the final goal in the Christian life. Lee's idea of these stages is consistent with his view of the four phases of faith explained in another place. It should be mentioned here that the final phase of faith is the phase of *love*, as we discussed in the previous section. Nevertheless, Lee ignores the imputed righteousness of Christ in these stages. Cf. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 141. Not surprisingly, Lee's idea of *perfection* appears to be influenced by John Wesley. However, Lee certainly modifies the perfectionism of Wesley with his distinctive idea of *unio mystica*, *oneness with Christ*, which is the climax of *contact* with the life of Christ in the Christian life. Cf. Jong-Ho Byun, *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki*, 30; Jong-Ho Byun, *Seoganjip*,

phrase “a principle of oneness” to mark the final phase of the Christian life.³⁵⁵ On the other hand, in another place Lee says that we can “be united with people and all things in the world.”³⁵⁶ In this way, Lee expands the notion of oneness with Christ to “all things” in the world. Thus, oneness with the love of Christ finally gets us united not only with God, but also with “all things,” and recovers the “gaps” that result from the sin of our first parents in the Garden of Eden, between “God and people,” or between “people and animals,” or “between all things in the world.”³⁵⁷ The full experience of love, then, also can be shown in the union with “all things.”

How does Lee’s concept of *oneness* with all creatures differ from the concept of the Reformers? Or does this oneness necessarily presuppose the relation between Christ and all creatures? In this idea of *oneness* with all creatures, Lee himself seems to have distorted the doctrine of union with Christ in justification. He evidently formulates this theory on the grounds that human beings are separated not only from God but also from all creatures in the world after the Fall, and that God also desires the believer to reconcile with all created

57; Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 70; Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 47; *Youngsungkwa*, 201, 204; *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 27, 31, 140; Min, *Kyowhoe*, 295; Sung-Sick Seo, *Yong-Do Lee*, 20, 34-37.

³⁵⁵ Back-Girl Sung sees the five stages of “oneness with the love of Christ” in Yong-Do Lee: (1) the stage of love and hope, (2) the stage of the inner sanctuary of love, (3) the stage of love fellowship, (4) the stage of oneness with the love of Christ, (5) the stage of the result of oneness—a new man. *Lee Yong-Doui Sangae*, 41-44. Sung’s argument includes oneness with Christ as the final stage of *perfection*, which is not much different from what we have discussed. Sung’s observation also supports the idea that oneness with Christ in Lee’s theology is irrelevant to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. Thus, it disproves the argument of those theologians, such as Se-Hyung Lee, Jung-Bae Lee, and In-Sick Choi, who claim that Lee’s doctrine of justification is a justification by faith alone. Cf. *Lee Yong-Doui Yongsungkwa*, 200-3, 212, 221-22, 244.

³⁵⁶ Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 28. Lee continues to pray, “Lord! Help us be united with each other [people and all things].” *Ibid.*

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

beings through the *principle* of *oneness*. In other words, those who do enjoy an experience of union with Christ may seek to be united with all created beings. Lee states that he himself tries to be united with a bird through prayer: “Help me to be *united* with the bird.”³⁵⁸ To deal with such things in the world, Lee distinguishes between union with God and union with all creatures: union with the love of Christ, which is the source of *life*, supplies the believer, who is the receiver, with his life; and then, with Christ’s life in him, the believer may seek to deny himself and be united with other creatures. At this point, Lee makes mistakes, mistakes in which he inadequately understands union with Christ and union with all things in terms of this principle of oneness, and fails to recognize the solidarity between Christ and his people. In any case, Lee’s discussion does not show that there is the correlation between union and imputation in this principle of oneness. Therefore, Lee completely departs from the doctrine of union with Christ as set forth by the Reformers.

An important omission occurs when Lee speaks of union with Christ: he is unaware of the federal headship of Jesus Christ and of its relation to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.³⁵⁹ That is, Lee fails to recognize that sanctification has its ground in justification, and that the entire *ordo salutis* has its “origin” in union with Christ.³⁶⁰ As a

³⁵⁸ Jong-Ho Byun, *Shinhack*, 53 (italics added). See also Jong-Ho Byun, *Yeonkoo Banseki*, 28. Here Lee reproaches himself because he thinks that due to “his unrighteousness” the bird fled away from him when he passed by it. In other words, his unrighteousness prevents him from being united with the bird.

³⁵⁹ Lee does not recognize the importance of the federal headship of Adam and Christ. Without establishing an adequate relationship between Christ and believer, it is inappropriate to explain union with Christ. Cf. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul’s Soteriology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1987), 57-58.

³⁶⁰ John Murray, *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992), 87, 161.

result of this, he seriously distorts the whole structure of soteriology, including the doctrine of justification. It is true that union and imputation cannot be separated in the doctrine of justification, for they are interdependent for the justification of the wicked. Without the union, the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked does not occur.³⁶¹ The Reformers understand that no one can become the "beneficiary of the efficacy and virtue" of Christ or the "partaker of Christ" without union with Christ.³⁶² On the contrary, under the influence of perfectionism, Lee does not see the imputation of Christ's righteousness in the union with Christ. Therefore, Lee's sanctification has its origin in the union with the "love of Christ," rather than the union with Christ who is the federal Head of the believer. Throughout the whole process, from justification to sanctification, Lee finds no place for the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and he finally denies the doctrine of forensic justification by God's grace alone through faith alone because of the imputed righteousness of Christ alone.

In bringing this analysis to a close, some conclusions can be given. First, Lee's emphasis on the unity of Christ and the believer is the fundamental goal of the Christian life. For Lee, traditional theological problems are no longer as attractive as they had been with his predecessors, such as Sun-Ju Kil and Ik-Doo Kim. Rather, he strongly attacks the churches with his distinctive teachings that are based on experience-centered theology. All things become genuine matters of spiritual fellowship with Christ.

³⁶¹ This union with Christ "binds" the believer to the "virtue of His death and the power of His resurrection." Murray, *Redemption*, 24-25, 141-43; Gaffin, *Resurrection*, 129-34.

³⁶² Murray, *Redemption*, 24-25, 163-65.

Secondly, the *principle of oneness* becomes the ground for the *double exchange of life* in his theology. One must develop a radical relationship with Christ through the *principle of oneness* for the *double exchange of life*. Through the *double exchange of life*, faith is imputed to us for righteousness through prayer, since faith comes through prayer and righteousness comes to us through faith. In conjunction with the double exchange of life, love and hope in “the suffering Christ” are crucial in Lee’s teachings. He stresses one’s “unconditional love” for Christ. Only after *experiencing* mystical union with Christ, can one understand the true relationship between Christ and oneself through the *double exchange of life*. However, this should not be taken to mean that there is foundation in his teachings for the imputed righteousness of Christ. To Lee, salvation is the victory over the flesh. In this sense, he disregards the importance of the material world. His messages resemble the experiential emphasis of Schleiermacher.

Thirdly, like Sun-Ju Kil, Yong-Do Lee tries to lead people into joy in the kingdom of God. At this point, his emphasis on humility before Christ in relation to the cross of Christ and love for Jesus Christ may make a fresh impression on the Korean churches. However, there is much confusion about the relationship between Jesus Christ and the believer. Lee adds confusion when he omits the federal headship of Christ as well as Adamic headship with respect to original sin. He rejects both aspects of imputation, taking issue with the vicarious view of Christ’s atonement. Unfortunately, Lee is unable to affirm the necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ with his *principle of oneness* and the *double exchange of life* whenever he speaks of the mutual relationship between Christ and

the believer. It should also be pointed out that Lee's soteriology is not built on the foundation on the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

E. Sung-Bong Lee (1900-1965)

During the fourth period of Korean revival, the effect of Sung-Bong Lee's ministry was to reemphasize evangelism in relation to revivals among the many churches in Korea—mainly the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Holiness churches. The theology of Sung-Bong Lee contains a profound understanding of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the sinner—much better than the three previous Korean preachers, for he seems to delight in saying that Christ's righteousness becomes the sinner's. If Christ's righteousness belongs to the wicked, is it then possible that Sung-Bong Lee's doctrine of justification follows the teachings of the Reformers? And if this is the case, how is faith related to imputation in Lee's theology? Moreover, if Lee agrees with the Reformers in the doctrine of imputation, is it then still possible with confidence to depend on God's grace both for faith and imputation? We shall now discuss what Lee means by the justification of the wicked, for these questions confront us with the meaning of faith in the doctrine of justification.

1. The Justification of the Wicked

Questions about faith in justification immediately lead us to the structure of the soul, which shows a relation between faith and justification. In the doctrine of justification, as we have seen throughout this study, free will is an important concept, because it also confronts the aspect of grace in salvation. If *sola gratia* has no place in one's doctrine of justification, he eventually honors human decision rather than God's will in justification. At this point, one also sees no necessary relationship between regeneration and the monergistic grace of God. How does Sung-Bong Lee describe the relationship between free will and

salvation? Is *sola gratia* denied and the power of free will honored more in his theology?

Or is it the other way around?

When discussing regeneration, Sung-Bong Lee begins by explaining the meaning of forgiveness. According to him, when one repents, one's sins are forgiven through the precious blood of Jesus Christ. In this manner, the doctrine of Christ's atonement is clearly expressed in his sermons. To Lee, repentance is the only way to heaven because of the sacrifice of Christ:

All his iniquities will be gone, deeply grieving and repenting when the light of the Holy Spirit comes upon his heart. One goes to hell, not because of one's sins but because of one's unrepentant heart. *Repentance is the foundation of salvation and the door to enter the heaven. ...Repentance is a command of God* and a condition to receive the Holy Spirit. Repent and believe the gospel (Mark 1:15)! Repent and have remission of sins. Then you will receive the Holy Spirit. In heaven, a feast will be held for every soul who repents (Luke 15:5-6).³⁶³

Indeed, here Lee is interested in the acts of the soul for repentance. One can easily see his main concern because he emphasizes repentance in his sermons, in which a person exercises the power of the will and demonstrates the activity of the will.

Why does a person need to repent? Regarding the nature of repentance, it is worthy to note his further explanation of the "motives" of repentance. Lee presents the following "motives" for repentance: (1) agony and suffering due to one's own "sinful nature" (Prov. 7:14; Lam. 3:39), (2) fear of "God's judgment" (Heb. 9:27), (3) "vanity" of life (Isa. 40:6), and (4) "hope" due to "God's love" (John 3:16).³⁶⁴ It is the first two motives that especially

³⁶³ "Sermons on Myungshimdo [A mirror of the heart]," in *Lee Sung-Bong Series No. 5*, 234 (italics added). For a similar statement, see "The First Four Sermons of the Lord," in *Lee Sung-Bong Series No. 4*, 122.

³⁶⁴ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:235.

draw our attention here, for in these two motives we find a relationship between human sin and the necessity of repentance, which is the necessary condition for salvation. In the first motive of repentance, for example, a person feels agony and suffers because of his *sinful nature*, and this motive shows the status of humanity.

It is important to note that when Lee discusses the necessity of repentance, he speaks of the doctrine of sin. In order for us to understand Lee's notion of the gospel, we should know how, in regeneration, God cleanses sins in the unbelieving heart. To Lee, there are two kinds of sin: "original sin and actual sin."³⁶⁵ What does he mean by "original sin and actual sin"? Does he defend the doctrine of original sin as taught by the Reformers? He defines actual sins as "unrighteous habit."³⁶⁶ Lee often brings this notion of actual sins into his theology, especially when he compares it with original sin. He also identifies original sin with "sinful nature."³⁶⁷ The theological consequence of this conception of original sin is that it mixes up actual sins with *sinful nature* and causes confusion in understanding the status of humanity, while at the same time differentiating unrighteous habit from *sinful nature* that is the effect of original sin.

On the one hand, Lee fundamentally confuses *actual sins* and *original pollution*, and does not clearly distinguish between original guilt and original pollution.³⁶⁸ Lee should

³⁶⁵ Sung-Bong Lee, 3:68.

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 71.

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.* Here he is right to call original sin "sinful nature."

³⁶⁸ Sung-Bong Lee, 4:80, 87, 131, 174; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:71; Sung-Bong Lee, 2:154.

recognize that original pollution resides in man and produces actual sins.³⁶⁹ He is right when he insists that a person is saved from the “punishment of sins”; he is correct in maintaining that the wicked are “forgiven” through the sacrifice of Christ.³⁷⁰ However, he also makes a radical mistake, for he does not find a close relationship between guilt and actual sins. This relationship is very crucial, for it helps us to see that the “guilt of sin” provides the foundation for the great doctrines of “atonement and justification.”³⁷¹

On the other hand, by avoiding the terms “total depravity” and “total inability,” Lee separates the sinful nature from actual sins, while the Reformers see a close relation between them. Lee should recognize that in relation to actual sins original guilt is a liability of punishment to be removed by the atoning sacrifice of Christ and by imputation, for the regenerate are still *simul justus et peccator* (simultaneously just and a sinner), as Luther rightly points out. But Lee does not recognize that God removes the guilt of sin from the unbelieving heart in justification. After God’s initial step in justification, he removes the pollution of sin in the believing heart in sanctification. This involves the doctrine of imputation, for one cannot understand what happens to the unbelieving heart in regeneration without knowing it. Therefore, without a sound understanding of the doctrine of original sin, it is almost impossible to understand the imputation of Christ’s

³⁶⁹ As Berkhof points out, original sin has two elements: “original guilt” and “original pollution.” Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 244-54. However, Lee does not admit that actual sins also spring from *sinful nature*.

³⁷⁰ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:152.

³⁷¹ John Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 2 (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1982), 88. Murray rightly points out that guilt is related to the “liability” of the wicked to God’s “wrath and curse.” He also sees the importance of the doctrine of “original sin and inability” as the ground not only for regeneration but also for sanctification. *Ibid.*

righteousness.³⁷² Thus, Lee does not see that after justification a Christian still has original pollution that produces actual sins.³⁷³ This confusion prevails throughout his theology.

Having isolated the explicit point of disconnection between sinful nature and actual sins in Lee's theology, let us return to the other question of what happens to repentance to see how Lee's treatment relates to free will. In his sermon "Repent," Lee briefly describes the four stages of repentance: "intellect, emotion, will, and act":

How then can we repent? It can be described as the stages of intellect, emotion, will, and act.

1. To Understand Sins Intellectually

It is for us to understand our sins and transgressions in our true state.... But, first of all, we must know our transgressions and sins, and honestly admit them; at the same time, there must be the prayer of the tax collector, "I am a sinner."... Thus, this is the first stage of repentance, in which a person understands his own sins, knows them, and admits that "I" am a sinner.³⁷⁴

In this manner, Lee discusses all the stages of repentance: the second stage of "emotion," in which a person "knows" his own state, "understands" his sins, "regrets" them, and "grieves" over them *in tears*; the third stage of "volitional confession," in which a person "voluntarily" confesses his sins.³⁷⁵ Does this mean that human beings are free to obey "God's command" to repent? In his discussion of repentance, the matter of free will, as the basic doctrine of human beings, comes into play. Lee never relates God's grace to the act of

³⁷² Hence, the Reformation doctrine of forensic justification by faith alone has contributed to Christianity in a marvelous way.

³⁷³ Recall that Lee defines actual sins as "unrighteous habit." With such a conception of actual sins, pollution turns out to be "actual sins" in Lee's terminology. Cf. Sung-Bong Lee, 3:71.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 45-46.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 45-46. Lee also stresses that for the fourth stage of repentance, there must be the fruits of repentance in Christian life in two ways: a "passive fruit" by which a believer removes sins in the past, and an "active fruit" by which a believer produces the "fruit of righteousness." *Ibid.*, 47-49.

repentance in his sermon “Repent.” He does not define *intellect* anywhere, but it is clear that he views it primarily as a human faculty. Specially, “intellect” is the capacity of a person to think and finally act according to the information through the act of the will, including the capacity to understand and to form convictions. Lee surely recognizes that the role of the intellect is relevant to salvation. It is interesting that he divides the human mind into faculties such as intellect, emotion, and will. In his sermon “Repent,” Lee carries on his argument as if the three faculties are each independent and separate from the others, each working separately within the mind. On the contrary, it is best to see that our mental faculties are highly interdependent, not independent.³⁷⁶

The faculty of the intellect in Lee’s anthropology exercises some form of *freedom*, although he certainly acknowledges that the “sin of Adam” has entered the world.³⁷⁷ At this point, the question regarding the relationship between *sola gratia* and *sola fide* arises. Does salvation depend on God’s decision or human decision? Is it possible for Lee to maintain that salvation comes from God, while he puts stress on the power of the intellect rather than the free grace of the sovereign God? The “gospel of grace,” he claims in his sermon “Religion of the Gospel,” is given to us as God’s promise:

God promises this *precious gospel of grace*. Whoever wants this and believes it will receive it without distinction. Nothing is impossible for God, but not for man. Is there anything that God cannot do? If you believe and rely on Him, God will immediately perform it (1 Thess. 5:23).³⁷⁸

³⁷⁶ Perhaps it is best to see *intellect*, *emotion*, and *will* as aspects of the “whole personality.” That is, human acts are acts of the “whole person.” Thus, Lee’s approach is rather misleading as a concept of anthropology. Frame, *Doctrine*, 329-44.

³⁷⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:68.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 65 (italics added).

Lee says here that the final act of free choice results in God's favor. When the will itself does act, it becomes both the cause and the recipient of the "gospel" of God's grace. Thus, freedom in Lee's soteriology remains in a certain sense even after the Fall, in which the will is free to consent to the gospel of God's grace, while free will in the Reformers cannot add any merit to man for salvation.³⁷⁹ Contrary to the Reformers, the intellect cannot be "completely passive" in relation to regeneration. But this raises the question of whether *sola gratia* is a decisive factor in justification.³⁸⁰ This notion of *gratia* is crucial to the understanding of Lee's doctrine of justification, for he is not advocating the will's dependence upon *God's grace*, although *sola gratia* is necessary in his soteriology; however, human beings can "cooperate" with the will to consent to the gospel.³⁸¹

Moreover, by classifying God's grace into two aspects in his sermon "More Grace," Lee is able to maintain a synergistic view of grace. There are a "temporary grace" that makes us "as white as snow," and an "unchangeable grace" that makes us "like wool."³⁸² Lee has no difficulty in maintaining both that the first step is to receive a "temporary" or "changeable" grace, and that the second step is to receive the highest grace, that is, an "unchangeable" grace of God:

³⁷⁹ Cf. G. C. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, trans. Hugo Bekker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980), 30-31.

³⁸⁰ In Lee's discussion, one can find *preparationism*: a person can encourage others to *prepare* their minds to receive Jesus Christ as their Savior.

³⁸¹ Cf. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 31.

³⁸² Sung-Bong Lee, 3:180.

Likewise, a person who receives *a temporary grace*, which hides and covers up his sins can be happy, but in a few days can completely lose the grace and expose his old state as it was. As a dog returns to its vomit, a sow that is washed goes back to make herself dirty again; likewise, we should not be satisfied with *this temporary grace*, but must go one step further and should long for *the grace like wool*, that is, *the grace* that essentially cleanses us and will never be changed.³⁸³

Certainly, here, Lee calls for the highest degree of God's grace. Of course, he is not arguing that the human will is dependent on God's grace. Rather, he calls for the will's decision to receive God's *unchangeable* grace. To Lee, this decision is to become more and more spontaneous, and growing. What he means is that spiritual maturity brings greater grace. Growing in divine grace means that we become more and more humble before God.³⁸⁴ For Lee, then, God's grace is neither something that preserves the life of a believer by God's work from the beginning to the end, as in the teachings of the Reformers, but something that can change according to the decision of the human will.

Not surprisingly, Lee at this point sees divine grace in salvation from an Arminian perspective, so that the degree of God's grace can be increased by the power of the will. Certainly, for Lee, there are some prerogatives that belong exclusively to human beings, for example, the right to increase the degree of God's grace or to receive God's grace. Who can have this grace of God? On what basis can a person increase grace? Lee answers these questions: God may give his grace (1) "to the thirsty (Psalm 107:9)," (2) "to the humble

³⁸³ Ibid (italics added).

³⁸⁴ In the same sermon, "More Grace," Lee again identifies three steps of grace, commenting on Ezekiel 47:3-5: (1) the grace of "ankle," with which a person very successfully attends church services, (2) the grace of "knee," with which a person has a grace of "prayer," and (3) the grace of "waist," with which a person has a grace of "service." Ibid., 182. However, there is no distinction between saving grace and sanctifying grace in his theology.

(James 4:6),” and (3) “to those who have faith (John 14:12).”³⁸⁵ This very answer of Lee seems to exclude any possibility of the monergistic grace of God in justification, because these conditions for God’s grace reject the exclusiveness of *sola gratia* in the Reformers. At this point, *sola gratia* is combined with human freedom in Lee’s doctrine of justification. Indeed, *sola gratia* is replaced with human freedom that has the power to increase divine favor.³⁸⁶ Therefore, in a certain sense, Lee’s doctrine of *grace* seems to support the idea of the *self-determining power* of the will, a view that is clearly shown in Timothy Dwight. Consistent with the power of the will, the act of faith, however, is crucial to his understanding of justification:

There is a time and an opportunity for man. He who takes advantage of this time will be successful.... Zacchaeus could receive Jesus Christ as he did not lose the chance because he thought that this would be *the last opportunity* for him when hearing that He was passing through. Tomorrow is not my day. Do not postpone, and do not be deceived by the devil little by little. “I tell you, now is the time of God’s favor, now is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2).”³⁸⁷

Lee assumes that the phrase “the last opportunity” has an obvious meaning, a meaning contrary to Reformation theology, and affirms an Arminian approach that assumes a synergistic perspective rather than *sola fide–sola gratia* in regeneration and justification, for in the sermon “Receive Jesus Christ,” Lee presents the “secret of Zacchaeus,” by which he receives Jesus Christ as his Savior.³⁸⁸ Lee adds a note about the act of faith in his

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 182-83.

³⁸⁶ Lee emphasizes the “experience” of grace, so that a person will be in the unchangeable state of grace. Thus, the experience of grace can be considered as the unchangeable grace. Ibid., 181.

³⁸⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 3: 23-24 (italics added).

³⁸⁸ Ibid., 22-27.

conclusion that “Zacchaeus could not receive Jesus Christ if he did not believe Him.”³⁸⁹ At this point, he is comfortable with the idea that free choice cooperates with saving grace, for it seems to him that the will is capable of choosing Jesus Christ as Savior.

Indeed, in describing justification by faith, Lee explains that we “should receive Jesus Christ by faith” since “the righteous shall live by faith (Romans 1:17).”³⁹⁰ In Lee’s view of justification, “faith” is more or less equivalent to “the act of the will” and equivalent to “the decision of the will,” disregarding any correlation with the work of God. In this way, Lee’s doctrine of faith implies *synergism*: “Sinners cannot have righteousness apart from Jesus Christ. Why? Because the Bible says that the righteousness of God is given to *all who believe through faith in Jesus Christ* (Romans 3:22).”³⁹¹ A closer look at Lee’s arguments on faith also reveals an Arminian scheme of “justification by faith alone.” In his sermon “As the Heavenly Father Will,” a parallel that becomes immediately evident is Lee’s connection of faith with the act of the human will:

The righteous shall live by faith. This faith is a faith with which we receive the things given by God and also submit all our things to the Lord in life. Jesus is the hand of God, and we can shake hands with God when we hold Jesus with *our hands of faith*.³⁹²

Lee then attempts to show how faith works in regeneration. It is significant for us to understand that Lee sees faith as the act of the human will. The phrase “by faith alone”

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 26.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 27.

³⁹¹ Ibid., 101 (italics added). The term “through faith” supports the idea of the consent of the will rather than *sola gratia* in Lee’s theology.

³⁹² Ibid., 120 (italics added).

stands against the Reformation theology of forensic justification by grace alone through faith alone because of Christ's righteousness alone. Specially, the term "our hands of faith," which is of importance, suggests such a confrontation with the Reformation theory of justification by faith alone. Likewise, the emphasis on human initiative through the act of faith is strong in his sermons. Thus, faith can make a point of contact with God in salvation. This is an idea with which the three previous Korean revivalists will agree.

What is the nature of the capacity that is faith? Here again, Lee gives an answer that is similar to his sermon "As the Heavenly Father Will." Lee says in one of the "Sermons on *Pilgrim's Progress*" that faith depends on the power of the will, but does not coordinate with God's grace in justification. He asserts that faith has an aspect of *freedom* in commenting on Romans 1:17:

Faith is an eye to see God; faith is a foot to make one's way toward God; faith is an ear to hear the voice of God; faith is a hand to hold God; faith is a tongue to taste God's grace. The righteous shall live by faith.³⁹³

Clearly, then, he gives priority to the act of faith in justification, although he admits in one of the "Sermons on Myungshimdo" that we are "justified by God's grace through Jesus Christ."³⁹⁴

The key to understanding Lee's use of the term "faith," in his sermons, is to keep in mind that he sees it as nothing more than consent to God's grace in Jesus Christ. Lee

³⁹³ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:119-20. Whenever Lee presents his interpretation of Romans 1:17, which is an obvious passage on the doctrine of justification, he never relates it to justification by faith alone. That is, in interpreting of Romans 1:17, he never mentions that a person is justified by faith alone, in the sense of Reformation theology. Cf. Sung-Bong Lee, 3:27, 69; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:122.

³⁹⁴ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:240. Here he does not use the phrase "by faith alone."

proceeds at this point in the “Sermons on Myumshimdo” to speak of the perseverance of “grace,” with which we will finally receive Jesus Christ “if we hold on to our sincere faith to the end.”³⁹⁵ He goes on to say “See to it, brothers, that none of you has a sinful, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God (Heb. 3:12). A man who *remains unrepentant* after many rebukes will suddenly be destroyed (Prov. 29:1).”³⁹⁶ In his trying to explain the result of the *unrepentant* who fall away (Hebrews 6:4), his terminology gets a little blurry, as he does not accept the idea of the perseverance of God from a saving grace to a sanctifying grace in the Christian life.³⁹⁷ If Lee is correct, then there is much to rethink regarding the Reformation doctrine of forensic justification by *sola gratia* through *sola fide*, for the wicked are unable to be declared just by God. Then, Lee has to structure the doctrine of justification for the wicked around the idea that no one can be declared just by God once for all, for the status of the *repentant* in the sight of God becomes more instantaneous, and changeable with their vulnerable faith.³⁹⁸ In such arguments, the doctrine of justification by faith alone remains unclear.

Although Lee does not point this out, it is important for us to understand that he uses the phrase “the justification of the wicked” to indicate the role of faith, which is the

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 248.

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 249 (italics added). It should be noted here that he emphasizes the term the “unrepentant.”

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 253.

³⁹⁸ Lee’s doctrine of justification is unable to give us a cogent argument and also is inconsistent because he argues that a person can lose his salvation if he falls away from God. This dilemma between the justification of the wicked and the status of the unrepentant is unacceptable, and it cannot be maintained in the light of *sola gratia* in the doctrine of justification. Because Lee makes this sort of argument, he may in one sense be called an Arminian.

role that the will ought to play in regeneration. Ultimately, for Lee, our commitment in the act of faith plays an important role in justification. It finally determines the justification of the wicked. In one of the “Sermons on Immanuel,” Lee speaks of the justification of the wicked as explaining a Christian in *Pilgrim’s Progress*:

The three angels [in *Pilgrim’s Progress*] are representatives of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; your sins are forgiven by the representative of the Father, *the justification of the wicked* is obtained by the representative of the Son, and the mark of salvation is sealed by the representative of the Holy Spirit.³⁹⁹

In Lee’s thought, the justification of the wicked is dependent upon the act of faith, an act of one’s “repentance” and “dependence on the cross of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁰⁰ Therefore, with the consent of the will, the wicked are sealed by the declaration of God that “you are mine.”⁴⁰¹ Certainly, Lee looks more closely at the function of the will by interacting with repentance in the doctrine of justification. In short, the primacy of faith, through the power of the will, is found abundantly in his teachings.

To sum up, we can see now how Sung-Bong Lee reconciles human freedom with God’s work of salvation in the doctrine of justification.⁴⁰² It does not come about through *sola fide–sola gratia*, which rules out any human merit in justification. Rather, it comes from the emphasis on the freedom of the will shown in the act of faith, a freedom by which

³⁹⁹ Sung-Bong Lee, 3:175-76 (italics added).

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid., 176.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid.

⁴⁰² Lee keeps on saying, “Don’t lose your chance,” or “You have to believe” to obtain salvation. Ibid., 14-15, 27; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:27; Sung-Bong Lee, 2:120-29, 148-56.

man initiates salvation, although Lee admits that salvation comes “only from God.”⁴⁰³

Beginning with a basic Arminian position on the importance of human freedom, he draws a conclusion that the Reformers, like Luther and Calvin, warn against. Where the Reformers exalt the divine will as the primary and crucial cause of salvation, Lee insists that the reason for divine acceptance lies in “human repentance” in the very nature of all who are accepted and saved by God. With this synergistic view of justification, a clear line cannot be drawn between justification and sanctification. The structure of Lee’s approach eventually puts in danger the spirit of the Reformation, that is, the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone by the imputed merit of Christ alone.

2. The Imputation of Christ’s Righteousness

In our discussion of Sung-bong Lee’s doctrine of justification, we saw that he considers faith as human commitment to obey Christ. Lee is more explicit on human freedom than on God’s grace in justification, referring as frequently to the necessity of repentance in justification, as he does in sanctification. He appears to believe that human beings can initiate repentance through the exercise of the will. Lee occasionally uses theological formulations that endorse the concept of self-sufficiency and self-reliance in an Arminian direction, as if we can make the work of salvation “depend on ourselves rather than on God.”⁴⁰⁴ Bearing this self-reliance in mind, how can the righteousness of Christ be

⁴⁰³ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:142. For Lee, regeneration is conditional because God opens the door for salvation when a person repents. Therefore, in his soteriology, repentance turns out to be an obligation. Sung-Bong Lee, 3:44.

imputed to the believer? What should we expect of the wicked for imputation? On what basis is that righteousness reckoned as ours by God? In order to examine adequately the notion of imputation in Lee, one must first seek his understanding of the human condition, that is, how he perceives the status of humanity in relation to God.

When discussing the status of humanity, Lee seeks to describe how the Fall of Adam affects man. All human beings, according to Lee, have no “righteous acts.”⁴⁰⁵ Man “cannot earn righteousness from the works of the law.”⁴⁰⁶ In this connection, Lee often refers to human righteous acts as “filthy rags” as described in Isaiah 64:6.⁴⁰⁷ He also asserts that man cannot be saved either “by himself” or “by all the righteousness of the world”; he can be saved only by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, “who never commits sins” at all.⁴⁰⁸ Lee emphasizes that human unrighteousness disqualifies all men for salvation and necessitates the righteousness of Christ. However, does Lee give any details about the relationship between Adam and his posterity? Lee asserts that there are “original sin and actual sins.”⁴⁰⁹ Thus, he defends his distinctive doctrine of original sin. Although he does

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. J. I. Packer, “Justification in Protestant Theology,” in *Here We Stand* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1986), 97.

⁴⁰⁵ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:125.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:15, 125. This kind of expression seems to be imported from John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, for Bunyan states that “I saw a man clothed with rages, standing in a certain place.” John Bunyan, *Works*, vol. 3, *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1991), 89.

⁴⁰⁸ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:125.

⁴⁰⁹ We are not going to discuss Lee’s doctrine of original sin again, since we discussed it in the previous section, except for the relationship between Adam’s sin and his posterity.

not use the standard terminology of imputation, what he implies seems somewhat relevant to imputation:

After committing sin and being caught in the act of hiding from God, Adam laid the guilt of his sin on Him, and shifted the responsibility of his sin on to Eve by saying that the woman God had created told him to eat, and he ate it: it is *the line of sin*. A small man avoids responsibility, but a great man bears responsibility.⁴¹⁰

This statement expresses a concept that is central to Lee's understanding of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. Imputation does occur in this "line of sin." In another place, Lee admits that "sin through one man, Adam," entered the world.⁴¹¹ The guilt of Adam's first sin is imputed to his descendants. Interestingly, Lee uses the term "solidarity" (collective responsibility) in his sermon "The Children of God," in relation to Cain and Abel after mentioning the sin of Adam:

The Lord said to Cain, "Where is your brother Abel?"... Cain wanted to go back home by himself after killing Abel, but the blood of Abel cried out. There should be no other crying out from behind us when we want to go back to our heavenly Father. Because man has *solidarity* [collective responsibility], we cannot say that the affairs of neighbors have nothing to do with us, and that we have no responsibility for things happening in our society or country.⁴¹²

Does Lee believe in a solidaric identity of all humankind with Adam in a *realistic* sense or a *federal* sense? If Lee's notion of solidarity expresses the union of humanity with Adam, his concept surely involves realism or federalism.⁴¹³ However, instead of presupposing the relation between Adam and his posterity as a solidaric identity, Lee here speaks of the

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., 194 (italics added).

⁴¹¹ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:68.

⁴¹² Sung-Bong Lee, 3:111 (italics added).

⁴¹³ Cf. Berkouwer, *Sin*, 436-65.

responsibility of God's children to help each other.⁴¹⁴ Although Lee affirms the doctrine of original sin in principle, he nevertheless often writes as if there were no obvious union between Adam and his posterity.⁴¹⁵ Lee often merely states in his sermons that all human beings have sinful nature and actual sins, rather than stating that a solidaric relationship exists between Adam and his posterity.⁴¹⁶

What connection does original sin have to the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Although the relationship between Adam's sin and all humankind is far from obvious, what is important is that God's justice remains clear in Lee's theology. To know the status of fallen men is to know the necessity of Christ's atonement for the satisfaction of God's justice; given human unrighteousness, Lee appeals to the vicarious sacrifice of Christ for the sins of men, leading to the righteousness of Jesus Christ. Lee speaks of a forensic element in the vicarious atonement:

⁴¹⁴ In the sermon "The Children of God," Lee speaks of two types of God's children: (1) all human beings as God's children, and (2) the believers as God's *true* children. Sung-Bong Lee, 3:106-15.

⁴¹⁵ Perhaps Lee has some form of realism in his mind, since he recognizes the "line of sin" and the sinful nature of man. However, to my knowledge he never clearly defines "imputation." Instead, he uses the term "sin" broadly to describe the sinful nature of man rather than the imputation of Adam's sin. On this account, Lee's assertion that all the human beings are sinners may simply be an application of John Bunyan's theory in *Pilgrim's Progress* and thus may be accepted as due to Bunyan's influence. Cf. Sung-Bong Lee, 2:19, 61, 62, 68; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:33, 40, 108, 111, 135; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:150; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:39, 172, 194, 216.

Apparently, the doctrine of justification is clearly set forth in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, but not the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin. Bunyan, *Works*, 3:95-96, 154, 190, 199. Besides, the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin is not one of the major themes that can be easily found in Bunyan's other works. In *The Law and Grace Unfolded*, however, Bunyan conveys the idea of the imputation of Adam's sin more concretely than that of Lee: "As they come from Adam, they are in a sad condition, because he left them a broken covenant. Or take it thus: because they, while they were in him, did him break that covenant. O! this was the treasure that Adam left to his posterity; it was a broken covenant, insomuch that death reigned over all his children, and doth still to this day, as they come from him, both natural and eternal. Ro. v." Bunyan, *The Law and Grace Unfolded*, in *Works*, 1:504.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Sung-Bong Lee, 2:64, 83, 139, 140, 152, 193-95; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:68, 71, 156-58; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:39, 87, 107, 131, 174-75; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:20, 26, 41-43, 74.

On the Passover, the Israelites escaped from the punishment of Egypt by putting the blood of the lamb on the doorframe; likewise, we have nothing more to do with *the punishment of God's wrath* because the blood of Jesus Christ, the Lamb, is put on the doorframe of our mind. A prostitute named Rahab was saved by tying the scarlet cord when the city of Jericho was destroyed. He who believes the blood of the cross receives the privilege of the Lord.⁴¹⁷

Thus, Lee's concept of atonement involves a forensic matter of imputed punishment. Not only the forgiveness of sins but also the propitiation of God's wrath against the wicked is based on the "vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ."⁴¹⁸ The remission of sins and the transfer of God's wrath go hand in hand with the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ on the cross, because the second Adam, Jesus Christ, also "takes the guilt of all humankind."⁴¹⁹ As Lee says in another place: "Do not be under the supervision of the law. The cross of Christ completely fulfills the law. A Christian recognizes that the suffering of sins and the heavy burden of the law fall down under the cross."⁴²⁰

An important question about atonement, especially in relation to the law, is the role of Christ in justification. Despite some range in his use of language, Lee presents a consistent view. In his "Sermons on *Pilgrim's Progress*," Lee at times speaks of the gospel as the "grace of the gospel"; moreover, he compares the law and the gospel:

First, the law is given by Moses, but grace comes through Jesus Christ (John 1:17). Secondly, the law tells us that the wages of sin is death, but grace says that the gift of God is eternal life (Rom. 6:23)... Sixthly, the declaration of the law is condemnation

⁴¹⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:152 (italics added). For the notion of God's punishment, see *ibid.*, 152, 193; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:158, Sung-Bong Lee, 4:107, Sung-Bong Lee, 5:41, 227-28.

⁴¹⁸ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:92, 174; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:186.

⁴¹⁹ Sung-Bong Lee, 3:111, 158; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:244.

⁴²⁰ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:243.

and death (Gal. 3:10), but the *proclamation of grace is justification and life* (Rom. 8:12)... Eighthly, the law is concerned about what man can do for God, but grace about what Christ has done for men (Gal. 3:13).⁴²¹

Lee thinks that the law makes man “conscious of his sins” only, and that it is impossible for the law to save man from his sins without God’s grace in Jesus Christ.⁴²² On the one hand, the law only exposes the necessity of Christ’s atonement. On the other hand, to deal with the law, Lee also introduces imputation as the solution to the dilemma of human unrighteousness, in that Christ is considered as the only righteousness for the justification of the wicked.⁴²³ At this point, the fact is that “the grace of the cross” stands for forgiveness.⁴²⁴ Lee occasionally uses formulations that press the concept of imputation, maintaining that Christ becomes our “righteousness.”⁴²⁵ This certainly refers to the imputation of Christ’s righteousness for the wicked.

A closer look at Lee’s understanding of imputation reveals some interesting similarities to the Reformers, as well as some contrasts. His idea of imputation also discloses some disagreements with his three Korean predecessors. In one of two unequivocal disagreements with these predecessors, Lee’s concept of the imputation of

⁴²¹ Ibid., 38 (italics added). The term “grace” often signifies the gospel for Lee.

⁴²² In order to elucidate the role of the law, Lee presents a story of a sinner who comes to see a teacher of the law on Mount Sinai. In this illustration of the law, which is allegorized by the teacher of the law in the story, the sinner fails to get any help in terms of the burden of sins. This indicates that the works of the law cannot save the wicked from their sins. Ibid., 30-32, 38, 125.

⁴²³ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:75. For the justice of God, see *ibid.*, 2:98-99, 122, 195.

⁴²⁴ Sung-Bong Lee, *Pilgrim’s Progress*, 5:43. Lee also asserts that through the cross, “the burden of sins is taken.” Ibid.

⁴²⁵ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:75; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:27, 69, 101; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:52; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:43.

Christ's righteousness contains the Reformation idea of the double transfer: the transfer of our sins to Christ, and his righteousness to us.⁴²⁶ At this point, what remains of the justification of the wicked with respect to Christ's righteousness also includes forensic declaration, as shown above. Lee is a stronger defender of the imputation of Christ's righteousness than his three predecessors.

Lee's second disagreement with those predecessors has to do with the idea of Scripture, for he says that the word of God is the cause of justification. Lee sees the word of God as the solution to human unrighteousness, providing the cause of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. In this disagreement with his Korean predecessors, through the testimony of Mido [a beautiful truth] in his "Sermons on *Pilgrim's Progress*," Lee speaks of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in conjunction with God's word:

I believe all the words of promise given by Him, and rely on them. The word that Jesus our Lord came to save us; *the word that Christ becomes the righteousness of all believers; the word that Christ died for our sins and arose to make us righteous*; the word that He loved us so much to cleanse our sins through the blood of Jesus; the word that He became the only Mediator between God and men.⁴²⁷

Thus, for both Lee and the Reformers, the word of God provides the promise of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, to those who possess unrighteousness due to the fall of Adam. This is similar to *sola scriptura* of the Reformers.⁴²⁸ At this point, it seems that Lee

⁴²⁶ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:92, 174; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:111, 158; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:186; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:244.

⁴²⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, *Pilgrim's Progress*, 5:125-26 (italics added).

⁴²⁸ To be sure, Lee sees the word of God as the necessary ingredient of saving faith. In order to be saved, a person has to have the essential information about the gospel. In this sense, Lee reveals the idea of *sola scriptura* in his sermons.

recognizes the authority of the word of God while embracing *sola scriptura* as the formal cause for the justification of the wicked. However, this is not to say that Lee includes the idea of *sola fide–sola gratia* in justification, as we saw in the previous section.

With the notion of *sola scriptura*, Lee also appears to use the images of imputation in describing the guilt and shame of Adam and Eve because of their sin. By far the most prominent reference in his sermons is to the “covering up” of their sin with “fig leaves.”⁴²⁹ Lee uses such terms to portray the inability of human beings to save themselves by their efforts. This image is used in Lee’s general discussion of the necessity of the sacrificial “animal” in relation to the gospel in his sermon “The Religion of the Gospel”:

God came to see Adam and Eve, who were hiding among the trees, because He had pity on them. Calling to him, “Where are you, Adam?” God undressed the shattered cloak [fig leaves], and made garments of skin for them, and clothed them after killing an animal (lamb): eternally, this is the unchangeable religion of the gospel.⁴³⁰

Lee here combines the two images, particularly the cloak of fig leaves and the cloak of animal skin to elucidate the gospel. In this image of the cloak of animal skin, salvation is portrayed as the covering of human sins by the robe of Christ’s righteousness. This sermon also contains a reference to this image of the cloak of Christ’s righteousness. Reflecting on Matthew 20:28, Lee speaks of putting on the “robe of Christ’s righteousness” on the basis of the sacrifice of Christ.⁴³¹ This formulation has some significant consequences. With this formulation, Lee relates the covering up of the cloak of animal skin to the imputation of

⁴²⁹ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:19.

⁴³⁰ Ibid., 62.

⁴³¹ Ibid.

Christ's righteousness.⁴³² Therefore, the relationship between the two images involves some form of imputation because of his view of the robe of Christ's righteousness.

Does this mean that Lee would agree with the Reformers on the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked? Lee's argument seems similar to theirs, but with one notable difference. When God puts the robe of Christ's righteousness on a sinner, Lee says, he puts on him "the robes of righteousness, love, and holiness," based on the works of Christ.⁴³³ While the robe of Christ's righteousness is there, so also are the robes of love and holiness. This distinctive view of the "robe" distinguishes Lee's theology from that of the Reformers. He insists on this often enough that we can assume that it is presupposed in a statement like this. For him, God places on the believer not only the robe of righteousness, but also the robes of love and holiness at the same time.

Furthermore, Lee does not accept the traditional formula of the Reformers regarding the righteousness of Christ with which God clothes us when he justifies us. It is not his use of the phrase "the robe of Christ's righteousness" that differentiates his theory from that of the Reformers. Rather, Lee tends to weaken the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness by supposing that love and holiness are imputed along with righteousness.⁴³⁴ This includes justification, to be sure, but it also embraces sanctification.

⁴³² For the imputation of Christ's righteousness, he often says that Christ becomes "our righteousness." Ibid., 75; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:69, 120, 175; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:199.

⁴³³ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:62.

⁴³⁴ This may indicate the influence of John Wesley, or perhaps he merely wants to follow the confessions of the Korean Evangelical Church [Korean Holiness Church]. Kun-Whan Kang, "The Revivalist Work of Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in Kang Il-Koo and Kim Yeon Tae, eds., *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksaui Buhungwundong Chomyung* [A theological reflection on the revival movement of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee] (Seoul: Word of Life Book, 2000), 144; Kyung-Bae Min, "Reflections on the Revival Movement of the Rev.

It gets a little confusing if we talk about justification and sanctification without any distinction. And we do not adequately see how Christ's righteousness is reckoned as ours, if an imputation of love and holiness is mixed in with it.

When we understand the concept of the gospel, we see more clearly the tendency of the "holiness" language in Lee's theology. In his sermons on the gospel, Lee makes a clear statement about the nature of the gospel.⁴³⁵ He speaks of the "fourfold gospel": the gospel of "rebirth," of "holiness," of "healing," and of "the second coming."⁴³⁶ Thus, while the imputation of Christ's righteousness has some value in Lee's theology, it misses an important distinction between justification and sanctification and between the saving grace of God and the sanctifying grace of God in the Christian life. Therefore, although Lee apparently understands the imputed righteousness of Christ much better than his three predecessors, he does not limit it to the beginning of the Christian life, specially

Lee Sung-Bong," in *Buhungwundong*, 192; Young-Tae Han, "A Study of the Holiness of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 483-89.

⁴³⁵ Although Lee presents the gospel of regeneration, we must give attention to the nature of the gospel. It is important to see that Lee's notion of the gospel amounts to an emphasis on the power of the will rather than the primacy of God's grace. Lee also recognizes that his formulations reflect the theology of John Wesley or that of the Holiness Church. Sung-Bong Lee, 1:100; Sung-Bong Lee, 2:64-66, 39, 203; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:70-74; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:37-40; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:61. Cf. In-Kyo Chung, *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksaui Sangaewa Sulkyo: Kyui Buhungsulkyoaedaehan Sulkyohackchuck Bunsuck* [The life and sermons of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee: A homiletical analysis of the sermons on revival] (Seoul: Handl Publishing Co., 1998), 120-23; Myung-Hyuk Kim, *The Eighteen Hot Issues of the Korean Church: Its History and Potentiality* (Seoul: Kyujang Media Mission, 1998), 116-17; Sung-Kuh Chung, *History*, 166; Sung-Kuh Chung, *Korean*, 64; Myung-Hyuk Kim, "A Theological Reflection on the Life and Faith of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 160; Myung-Soo Park, "The Life and Revival Movement of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 230, 254-55; Ki-Ho Sung, "The Fourfold Gospel and Revival Movement of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 281-89; Young-Tae Han, "A Study of the Holiness of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 483-89; Chi-Mo Hong, "The Life and Thoughts on Faith in the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 502.

⁴³⁶ Sung-Bong Lee, 3:70-88; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:37-48.

justification, somewhat like his three predecessor. The Reformers are also interested in the entire Christian life, but they limit imputation to the justification of the wicked.

This raises the question of how Christ's righteousness is imputed to the wicked. What then is the relationship between faith and the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Indeed, Lee often says, "The righteous shall live by faith."⁴³⁷ Unlike the Reformers, however, he does not explain how Christ becomes our righteousness by faith. Lee merely uses the phrase "justification by faith" without any connection to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. In any case, it is difficult to find the relationship between faith and righteousness. To be more specific, his favorite words for imputation are "taking off our clothes of rags" and "putting on a new robe."⁴³⁸ At this point, it is obvious that Lee does not oppose the Reformers' language of imputation. However, it is not clear that he assumes that faith is closely correlated with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, like the Reformers who taught that the sovereign grace of God precedes the act of faith.⁴³⁹ Lee never speaks of "counting," "reckoning," "transferring," or "imputing" the righteousness of Christ to the wicked by faith alone in terms of the Reformation theology.⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:75; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:69, 120, 175; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:199.

⁴³⁸ Sung-Bong Lee, 4:25, 52, 226-28; Sung-Bong Lee, 2:174; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:175; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:136-37.

⁴³⁹ The act of faith precedes the imputation of Christ's righteousness in Lee's thought, as we have seen. In other words, Lee's doctrine of justification by faith shows a synergistic view of justification.

⁴⁴⁰ When discussing the doctrine of justification by faith, Lee never explicitly indicates the relationship between faith and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Rather, he simply urges people to have faith in Jesus Christ. Sung-Bong Lee, 2:65, 120-24, 145-46, 151, 174; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:27, 69, 101, 120, 175; Sung-Bong Lee, 4:52, 155, 157-58, 228; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:65, 125, 143.

In connection with imputation, it is important to note that Lee often relates union with Jesus Christ. For example, in one description of the experience of life, Lee speaks of union with Christ in interpreting Romans 8:1-2:

But he who walks in the light lives according to the word of God in the eighth chapter of Romans. Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are *in Christ Jesus* (Rom. 8:1). Because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death.⁴⁴¹

It seems here that Lee appeals to Romans 8:1-2 as his crucial passage on union with Christ. It is hard to imagine that Lee would disagree with Calvin on this point. However, the relevant question is: What is the nature of this union? Does Lee want to describe the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked by speaking of union with Christ? Lee makes it clear on several occasions that only those who seek the "experience of the cross," an experience that they "have been crucified with Christ," will be led to their ultimate commitment to God and will glorify the Lord.⁴⁴² Such persons experience the cross of Christ in their hearts. On the contrary, people who do not experience the cross of Christ, in being crucified with Christ on the cross, are called the "legalists who deny the grace of the gospel."⁴⁴³ Therefore, it seems that Lee presupposes union with Christ as the foundation of justification, when he presents union with Christ in his sermons.

Are there then some parallels between Lee and the Reformers regarding this union with Christ? Both of them seem to see union with Christ as an important element of the

⁴⁴¹ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:140 (*italics added*).

⁴⁴² Sung-Bong Lee, 5:244.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*

gospel. However, the Reformers present far more clearly the role of union with Christ in connection with the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. In this regard, the overall approach of the Reformers is far superior to that of Lee. The difference between the two is a difference in emphasis on justification and sanctification. For example, speaking of the "sanctified person," Lee states:

The eighth picture [the sanctified person] shows that a person not only goes on serving the Lord faithfully, having the experience of thorough repentance and regeneration, but also reaches *a point of sanctification*, for he has *been crucified with Christ*, having the resurrected Christ Jesus in his heart; and he no longer lives, but Christ lives in him.⁴⁴⁴

This is precisely the kind of statement in which Lee sees faith as "living daily" in the "awareness that Christ lives in us."⁴⁴⁵ This kind of statement serves to underscore his fundamental point of view, whereby Lee can disclose union with Christ.⁴⁴⁶ However, by now it has become clear that Lee never wishes to speak of "union with Christ" in connection with justification. It is important to see not only justification, but also sanctification, as "inseparable from union with Christ," as Hoekema points out.⁴⁴⁷ Lee is correct, therefore, when he speaks of union with Christ in terms of sanctification. However, justification is not seen in "the light of a union with Christ" in which the wicked "identify" themselves with Christ.⁴⁴⁸ Lee only wishes to call our attention to the fact that a person is

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., 264 (italics added). Cf. Ibid., 131.

⁴⁴⁵ Hoekema, *Saved*, 60.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., 60-61.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., 61.

“sanctified through union with Christ.”⁴⁴⁹ Therefore, having this view of union with Christ, he eventually denies one side of soteriology, justification, in order to emphasize the other side, that is, sanctification.

To explain sanctification, Lee often mentions *unio cum Christo*. The main reference, as we have seen, is to Galatians 3:20. In his “Sermons on *Pilgrim’s Progress*,” Lee also correlates it with the notion of marriage, a spiritual marriage in the Song of Songs. For example, speaking of the soul drawing near to the “experience of grace,” Lee states:

This is paradise. At this point, a person personally reaches *the summit of the experience of grace: it is the point of sanctification. I am in Christ and He is in me*; I and the world no longer are in place, but only the Redeemer is seen. I no longer live, but Christ lives in me.⁴⁵⁰

Lee suggests here that a believer who has “the experience of grace” through *unio cum Christo* will be conformed to the likeness of Christ, such as “His character, His spirit, and His life.”⁴⁵¹ What Lee also means here is that *unio cum Christo* powerfully brings in the highest degree of sanctification. In any case, Lee never links *unio cum Christo* with the theme of justification. He gives no quotation or reference that would suggest such a connection. Rather, he deals primarily with the theme of sanctification. In a similar way, Lee also mentions union with Christ in connection with the victorious life of the Christian in his sermon “The Sanctified”:

I am in Christ and He exists in me. Hallelujah! It does not mean that such a person will not have various temptations or trials. But the living Jesus [Christ] dwells in him,

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 62-63.

⁴⁵⁰ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:130 (italics added).

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*

and wins the victory. We are more than conquerors through him who loved us (Rom. 8:37).⁴⁵²

It bears repeating that for Lee union with Christ is God's doing. Lee also has this to say about reaching the highest degree of sanctification: "*He becomes one with Christ*. God leads his emotion, his personality, his spirit, his life, and his character, and changes them into Christ's, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ."⁴⁵³ It is clear here that God is doing the transforming. Similarly, Lee often refers to the bride surrendering wholly to the experience of grace.⁴⁵⁴

Another characteristic of Lee's notion of *unio cum Christo* is that it involves "the fullness of the Holy Spirit."⁴⁵⁵ This is crucial for understanding the nature of the relationship between Christ and a believer in Lee's theology. In his sermon "The Spirit of Christ," for example, he quotes Christ as speaking Revelation 3:20 to a person:

Here I am! I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with him, and he with me. Let us invite the living Christ into our inner room. Do not let Him live in a rented room, but invite Him into the center of our

⁴⁵² Ibid., 265.

⁴⁵³ Ibid (italics added). Lee's notion of union reflects the perfectionism of John Wesley. However, it would be unnecessary to cite every example of Wesley's influence, since we have seen some examples already. Cf. Kun-Ho Choi, "The Revival Movement of Faith and Church Growth in Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 101-3; Kun-Whan Kang, "The Revivalist Work of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 144; Myung-Hyuk Kim, "A Theological Reflection on the Life and Faith of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 165; Kyung-Bae Min, "Reflections on the Revival Movement of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 192; Young-Tae Han, "A Study of the Holiness of Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 487-9; Chi-Mo Hong, "The Life and Faith of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee," in *Buhungwundong*, 504.

⁴⁵⁴ Sung-Bong Lee, 5:130-31. Lee clearly teaches that Christians are "the bride of Christ." Sung-Bong Lee, 3:71, 118, 136; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:131.

⁴⁵⁵ Sung-Bong Lee, 2:80.

inner room; and *let us be filled with the Spirit of Christ and live a life of being united together with the Lord.*⁴⁵⁶

God responds to an act of humility to share Christ with the bride by the work of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, a person who “invites” Jesus Christ into his heart and seeks again an intimate experience by “the fullness of the Holy Spirit,” will “be united with Christ.” This clearly explains again that Lee’s notion of *unio cum Christo* is deeply rooted in the doctrine of sanctification. Believers are capable of being united with Christ through the act of faith.

Who, then, can have such an experience of union? Lee’s answer is that all believers perform an act of “crucifying” themselves “on the cross.”⁴⁵⁷ It is “an experience of repentance and self-denial,” Lee says, “which crucifies self-centeredness.”⁴⁵⁸ Indeed, it includes the act of faith that brings us true repentance, and it is based on “the cross of Christ.”⁴⁵⁹ Lee even suggests that those whose faith is strong will finally have the “experience of grace.”⁴⁶⁰ To sum up Lee’s notion of *unio cum Christo*, he is comfortable with using the expression “union with Christ” in order to describe an intimate experience with God. He is right that a Christian is sanctified by *unio cum Christo*; but he needs to know more about the essential nature of *unio cum Christo*, the nature of justification in *unio*

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid. (italics added).

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., 95-96.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid. 95-96; *ibid.*, 101.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 2:91-5.

⁴⁶⁰ This “experience of union” can be called the “experience of grace,” as we have already seen. Ibid., 2:80, 95, 101; Sung-Bong Lee, 3:107; Sung-Bong Lee, 5:130, 244, 264-65.

cum Christo, and the correlation between *unio cum Christo* and the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

How then does Lee's argument work, given the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Why does he restrict imputation or union to sanctification? Perhaps the best example to discuss the nature of imputation in relation to Christ's righteousness is his sermon "The Christian's Duty to the Peace of the Church," reflecting on Romans 15:1-7:

The Bible is reviving the soul (Psalm 19:7). It gives endurance, encouragement, and hope. *It was credited to him as righteousness*. The words ["it was credited to him"] were written not for Abraham alone, but also for us, to whom *God will credit righteousness* (Rom. 4:23-24).⁴⁶¹

This might be interpreted as works-righteousness. However, Lee never wishes to speak of "human merits" that are not effected by grace. Other statements highlight his fundamental point of view. For example, in his "Sermon on the Book of Jonah," Lee claims that Abraham's faith is similar to Job's: "Abraham, who in hope believed against all hope that he would become the father of many nations (Rom. 4:18), has the same faith as Job's, by which he said that he would trust God even if He would take away his life."⁴⁶² Lee here clearly speaks of the imputation of Christ's righteousness on the assumption that the imputed merit of Christ cannot be understood apart from *the act of faith or the power of the*

⁴⁶¹ Sung-Bong Lee, 4:155 (italics added). To my knowledge, this is the only place where Lee uses the term "credit" in relation to imputation in all of his sermons. However, he never uses the terms "counting," "reckoning," "transferring," or "imputing" (the righteousness of Christ) in the sense of the Reformers, as we have seen.

⁴⁶² Sung-Bong Lee, 5:180-81. On the imputation of Christ's righteousness by faith, Lee has little to say, for he believes that the act of faith precedes the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as we have said before. Also, it must be mentioned here that Lee never sees the relationship between Christ and his people in terms of *federalism*, like Jonathan Edwards. Perhaps this might be the reason why Lee emphasizes the act of faith in his doctrine of imputation.

will resulting in the imputation of Christ's righteousness.⁴⁶³ As we have seen, that act of faith involves free choice, and it is nothing more than consent to God's imputation of Christ's righteousness. In this manner, Lee's view of imputation reveals only a synergistic view of justification.

What is the role of the Holy Spirit in this imputation? In one of the "Sermons of Myumshimdo, the Regenerate," Lee says, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If anyone claims to believe in Jesus Christ but has not received the Holy Spirit, he is the most miserable man in this world. If anyone does not receive the Holy Spirit, he does not belong to Christ."⁴⁶⁴ He goes on to say that God generously gives us the Holy Spirit "through Jesus Christ our Savior, so that having being justified by his grace, we might become heirs having eternal life (Titus 3:6-7)."⁴⁶⁵ Lee points out in this sermon that the act of the Holy Spirit is relevant to the imputation of Christ's righteousness. He clarifies again the role of the Holy Spirit: "The Spirit gives us rebirth, sanctifies us, gives us eternal life, gives us wisdom, and bears fruit abundantly (Gal. 5:22)."⁴⁶⁶ Thus, regeneration takes place "through" the Holy Spirit.

Who then can receive the Holy Spirit? In his sermon "Receive the Holy Spirit," Lee speaks of the five ways to receive the Spirit: (1) hold onto God's promise, (2) repent, (3) obey, (4) believe, and (5) listen to the word of God.⁴⁶⁷ Here he stresses that the coming

⁴⁶³ We are not going to repeat Lee's view of faith here, since we discussed the act of faith in the previous section.

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 239.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 240.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 239. Cf. Sung-Bong Lee, 4:30.

⁴⁶⁷ Sung-Bong Lee, 4:27.

of the Spirit depends on the human will, rather than the divine will. It is strange, however, that Lee clearly teaches the doctrine of divine election in his sermon “The Purpose of God’s Choice.”⁴⁶⁸ And it is another way of speaking of the “grace of choice.”⁴⁶⁹ How can Lee maintain the free will of man with God’s foreknowledge in salvation? Is it possible to connect human freedom with the doctrine of election? We find God’s foreknowledge in his teachings as he urges people to have faith in God’s election. Lee describes God’s foreknowledge as the “basis” of divine election:

First of all, let us stand firm in the faith of election.... God chooses us because He knows us well. People choose others without knowing each other very well, and turn their back upon them when they are not pleased with each other. But, when our Lord chooses us, He knows all our weaknesses, mistakes, sins, and transgressions. God chooses imperfect people to reveal His glory, just like parents love weak and sick children more.⁴⁷⁰

What does he mean that God foreknows us well? On Lee’s view, there is a *prima causa* (the first cause) problem of reconciling the act of the human will and God’s will in salvation. Does God’s will follow human decisions in salvation? In the sermon “The Purpose of God’s Choice,” Lee, unlike the Reformers, is unable to make a clear distinction between God’s foreknowledge and human decision in the work of salvation, since Lee does not make it clear whether God’s foreknowledge or human decision is the prime cause of regeneration.⁴⁷¹ Rather, he wishes to speak of divine election without linking it with

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., 164-68.

⁴⁶⁹ Sung-Bong Lee, 4:160-61.

⁴⁷⁰ Sung-Bong Lee, 3:164.

⁴⁷¹ In another place, Lee addresses the grace of election, arguing that our salvation is an “absolute salvation.” Sung-Bong Lee, 4:160. He also insists that God never “abandons” his chosen people. Does he here

regeneration. Why he does not connect God's foreknowledge with human decision in salvation is unclear; perhaps he does not see it as necessary for the purposes of his theological system. In any case, Lee is not consistent in maintaining either the doctrine of the human will or the doctrine of divine election in regeneration.

With respect to divine election, when Lee speaks of God's foreknowledge, it seems that he intends to appeal to election in Jesus Christ. However, at the same time, Lee does want to insist upon election in the act of faith, although he uses the term "the grace of election."⁴⁷² In other words, the conditional work of faith must accompany the election of God's grace through Jesus Christ in Lee's theology.⁴⁷³ Unlike the Reformers, Lee does not accept the Reformation formula correlating faith and "God's choice" in justification, a relation in which the act of faith keeps in harmony with God's election under the notion of *sola gratia*.⁴⁷⁴ In Lee's doctrine of divine election, an Arminian soteriology is inescapable: a person who has faith in Jesus Christ is chosen by God. In fact, Lee is deeply concerned with the act of repentance and faith in his theology.⁴⁷⁵ This eventually results in works-

speaking of the *potentia absoluta* (absolute power) of God in salvation, which would suggest the sovereign grace of God? Cf. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 53-73. There is no further explanation of the term "absolute salvation" in Lee's sermons. Thus, Lee's concept of divine election does not give him a firm ground on which to build a strong doctrine of the sovereign grace of God together with a strong doctrine of human freedom.

⁴⁷² Cf. Berkouwer, *Divine Election*, 75-76.

⁴⁷³ Berkouwer criticizes the Arminian failure to understand God's election in Jesus Christ, arguing that faith can never become the "condition" of election. Like Sung-Bong Lee, the Arminian error does not begin with the doctrine of *sola gratia* in interpreting Ephesians 1:4, but with the "condition of faith" in election in Jesus Christ. Likewise, the Arminian fails to recognize the decisive factor of God's grace in justification, the *sola gratia* of the Reformers, in which human merit is completely ruled out. *Ibid.*, 144-49.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 149-50.

⁴⁷⁵ Likewise, Lee supports the notion of *self-reliance* in justification, as we have seen.

righteousness, in line with the views of his three Korean predecessors. Lee takes an Arminian view of the reception of the Holy Spirit and fundamentally attributes salvation to the power of the will and neither to God's grace nor the divine will, although he probably would not want to put it that way. An exercise of the human will, rather than "God's gracious decision," is key in justification.⁴⁷⁶

In conclusion, Sung-Bong Lee desires to explain the doctrine of justification in his sermons. Probably he wishes to distinguish his theology from the approaches of the three famous Korean revivalists in the doctrine of justification. Unlike his predecessors, his understanding of the doctrine of Christ's imputed righteousness is clearly shown in several places, particularly in his "Sermons on *Pilgrim's Progress*." According to Lee, a person who is qualified for the heavenward journey exercises his will to be united with Christ. Lee is right that human effort is involved in sanctification. Nevertheless, Lee goes too far when he discusses union with Christ in relation to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. At this point, Lee teaches that God does not necessarily save people by his own will. He seems clearly to say that man has the ability to take the initiative to receive the imputed righteousness of Christ. He never sees the relationship between Christ and his people in terms of Christ's federal headship. Thus, Lee sets forth his arguments based on works-righteousness, unlike the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers. In his sermons, he confuses justification with sanctification.

⁴⁷⁶ Lee sees neither the relationship between God's will and union with Christ nor the relation between God's gracious decision and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Indeed, he does not correlate *divine election* and union with Christ. It is not necessary to discuss Lee's doctrine of election here, since we did so in the previous section. Cf. Hoekema, *Saved*, 56-57.

Overall, Lee's view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness contains an Arminian element. On the one hand, Lee does more characteristically speak of imputation, but he speaks frequently enough of it being based on human merits, rather than the imputed merit of Christ by grace alone. On the other hand, he quite frequently speaks of union with Christ in connection with sanctification as being in the power of repentance and self-denial. Unfortunately, Lee, in the line of famous revivalist preachers in Korea, does not have a breakthrough of understanding of the doctrine of imputation, even though he does speak of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Still, his theology is far from the Reformed doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

F. Conclusion

In the early twentieth century, the theological differences between the Calvinist Presbyterian and the Arminian Methodist missionaries, who had been raised in the American atmosphere of the Arminian revivalism of Finney and Moody, could be either denied or minimized because the union movement sought to evangelize Korea effectively together and to shun theological debate—even though they had quite different theological backgrounds. The Presbyterian missionaries, as conservative Calvinists, sought to defend Scripture as the ultimate authority in the Christian life. However, it seems that they were not devoted enough to teaching Korean Christians how significant justification by faith alone is.

Perhaps the Presbyterian missionaries thought that the union movement removed their responsibility to bring in the legacy of the Reformers, the principle of *sola fide*—*sola*

gratia in the doctrine of forensic justification. Instead, they agreed with the Methodist missionaries to promote revivalism and share their evangelistic zeal with the Korean Christians. No one would deny that their enthusiasm was a necessary ingredient on the mission field. As a result, however, it proved very difficult to distinguish a Calvinistic view from an Arminian view, not only in revivalism, but also at the core of the gospel, the doctrine of justification by faith alone. The American missionaries played a crucial role in formulating the Arminian view of revivalism in the early Korean churches.

During the early twentieth century, Calvinistic influence on revivalism faded as Arminian revivalism gained strength. Sun-Ju Kil, a Presbyterian revivalist, had picked up the term “revival” from the missionary school of the union movement, and he promoted Arminian revivalism, which spread throughout the Korean churches during the Great Revival of 1907. Ik-Doo Kim, another Presbyterian revivalist, inherited Kil’s Arminian revivalism and developed its Arminian point of view. Kim emphasized the need of prayer for healing in revival meetings, but in this respect he was not different from many other Arminian Methodists. Yong-Do Lee also accepted the Arminian view, but his emphasis on mystical experience distinguished him from the previous Presbyterian revivalists. His focus on religious experience essentially undermined the authority of Scripture. Sung-Bong Lee was certainly a Wesleyan, and he welcomed that label. Lee gave the human will a significant role to play in revivals. Thus, all four revivalists helped to spread Arminian revivalism in the Korean churches in the twentieth century.

But, more importantly, Arminian revivalism also influenced the doctrine of justification by faith alone in these Korean preachers. According to Sun-Ju Kil, the

reception of divine grace in salvation is decided by human decision. Ultimately, it is not necessary for human beings to subordinate their will to God's sovereign grace in salvation. Kil's view of the primacy of the will is based on his ambiguous view of God's grace. In discussing the primacy of the will in man, he makes two points: a partial corruption of human nature, and the power of free will to choose God's grace in salvation. Kil does not make a clear distinction between justification and sanctification. He says virtually the same thing in describing the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Kil denies the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants and says rather that they participate in the same system of temptation. Kil's view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is similarly weak. He insists that an act of faith is reckoned as a transfer of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, a transfer that takes place with a decision of the will. It is evident that Kil's view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is greatly influenced by Arminianism.

Ik-Doo Kim's view on justification is different from Kil's, but it is not successful as a critique of the Arminian view. On the contrary, Kim also maintains that human beings can achieve God's favor in salvation. He insists that the power of prayer can influence the act of faith in justification. In this respect, nothing in Kim's view justifies the view that he is a Calvinist in terms of justification. In fact, Kim bases justification on some form of active capability of the human will, similar to Kil. Nevertheless, this emphasis on the capacity of the will distinguishes his view from Kil's in justification: a person is justified by faith in Christ through prayer alone. Kim's argument fails to take adequate account of Calvin's definition of justification, namely the notion of the reception of the alien righteousness of Christ and the primacy of God's grace. By stressing the Holy Spirit as the

power of God, Kim basically agrees with Kil, but tries to clarify the matter by distinguishing between the act of faith as an answer to prayer in Kil's theology and the work of the Holy Spirit as an answer to prayer in his theology. He understands union with Christ in terms of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He misunderstands Adamic and Christological imputation, much like Sun-Ju Kil. When they fail to see the relationship of Adam to his posterity and of Christ to the believer, they also fail to see the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. Therefore, Kim's unclear doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ appears to conflict with the Reformers' teaching, specifically with respect to *sola fide–sola gratia* in justification.

Yong-Do Lee has very different ideas from those of the two Presbyterian revivalists about the doctrine of justification. Lee also grants the importance of prayer to gain faith. For Lee, however, personal experience is a very serious matter. Such stress on mystical experience affirms that there is freedom to choose the life of Christ. At this point, human efforts amount to human merit for justification. Lee speaks not only about righteousness as truth, but also about truth as love. It is very important to stress these interconnections. Ambiguity in these terms makes Lee deny the doctrine of justification by faith alone as taught by the Reformers. For the most part, the notion of feeling is interwoven with these terms in the conversion experience. Lee teaches the loss of divine grace, the influx (impartation) of life, and the double exchange of life, explaining that a person can get righteousness through prayer. At any rate, he never clearly defines righteousness or justification. That fact makes it difficult to understand his distinctive idea of *the double exchange of life* in the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

The phrase “the double exchange of life” comes from his experience-centered theology. Lee uses the concept of *the double exchange of life* to explain the necessity of spiritual fellowship with Christ, rather than the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. Thus, the idea of this double exchange is quite different from the idea of the double transfer as taught by the Reformers. Rather, he treats this double exchange as a way to have a victorious Christian life. It is also similar to the *principle of oneness*, which is also the ground for the *double exchange of life*. Lee sees this principle of oneness as a step to having union with Christ in order to share the suffering of Christ’s cross, not as union with Christ for the imputed righteousness of Christ.

Of the four revivalists, Sung-Bong Lee’s concept of justification is the least unlike that of the Reformers. Lee describes how the fall of Adam affects human beings. However, as we have seen, he does not grant that actual sins come from sinful human nature. On the basis of original sin, Lee maintains that God cooperates with human beings in salvation. At this point, he affirms that repentance results in divine acceptance in justification. On this account, divine election has nothing to do with regeneration. This formulation of divine election depends on a conditional work of faith in Lee’s theology. On this synergistic view of justification, it is evident that divine grace can cooperate with human freedom. In describing universal atonement, Lee disregards the correlation between God’s work and the act of faith. Evidently, Lee never sees the relationship between Christ and the believer in connection with Christ’s federal headship. It is significant to note that Lee departs from his three predecessors in the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. He clearly describes the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the wicked, but with a somewhat

different meaning than that of the Reformers. Lee speaks of “putting on the robe of Christ’s righteousness” to describe imputation. However, he adds “the robes of love and holiness” to it, which indicates that he is talking about sanctification. Apparently, for Lee union with Christ has to do with sanctification, but not with justification. Lee never sees union with Christ as the foundation of justification. Therefore, his doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness departs from that of the Reformers.

Unfortunately, the four Korean revivalists took over Arminian revivalism from the American missionaries as a result of the union movement. These revivalists failed to inherit the heritage of the Reformers, either in the forensic doctrine of justification by faith alone or in the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the wicked.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Regardless of how we evaluate the doctrine of justification, we cannot deny the importance of the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith alone and its contribution to the gospel since the Reformation. In the history of the Christian church, the doctrine of justification has been severely challenged by the Pelagians and the Arminians. The Reformation doctrine of justification is still not taken seriously by many people whose attention ought to be paid to the gospel, as we have seen in the recent controversies over the ECT documents. Christians need to rediscover the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked, since without it the message of the gospel does not exist. Generally, as we have seen in examining the teachings of six prominent American and Korean revivalists, Arminian revivalism is rooted in an inadequate doctrine of justification. The great need of our time is a greater recognition of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked in justification.

Because of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, Protestants established their distinctive identity in the doctrine of forensic justification. As we have seen in this study, the controversy over revivalism was in important ways analogous to the controversies faced by the Reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin. We have seen that the preparationist Puritanism was not similar to the Arminianism in the concept of preparation for salvation.

The chief difference between them was in the evaluation of the power of the will. There was no room for human ability to earn salvation in the doctrine of the preparationist Puritanism, which was consistent Calvinism. For the preparationist Puritanism, there was a place for encouragement in waiting for the Lord for salvation. Nevertheless, there is much here to make us think. There was recognition of the need for more than mere probability in grounding salvation in human preparation. The arguments of the preparationist Puritanism suggested some human ability to believe in Jesus Christ, although they strongly believed that the work of the Holy Spirit prepared the wicked for salvation.

However, the Arminians start with the power of the will in salvation. This power of the will includes human ability to obtain salvation in revivals. Therefore, the supremacy of the sovereign grace of God set forth in Reformed theology is simply denied by them. For the Arminians, the Reformers fail to see that God has graciously given to people the power of the will to obtain salvation. The Arminian assumption of human ability is highly debatable; the argument that a new form of strong preparationism always allows people to have the initiative in the imputation of Christ's righteousness is also weak. In the early eighteenth century, Solomon Stoddard made an issue of preparationism in the Halfway Covenant, asking whether professing Christians could wait for the grace of God in salvation. On these matters, Jonathan Edwards adopted a Calvinistic perspective. In discussing the Halfway Covenant, Edwards declined the Arminian contention that the influence of the Holy Spirit could be determined by preparatory works, and articulated the doctrine of justification by faith alone. For Edwards, the Reformers employed a correct theological method in salvation, unlike the Arminians. In any case, Edwards never supported strong

preparationism, or Arminianism in revivalism or in the doctrine of forensic justification. His Calvinistic view of revivalism decisively refuted such Arminian teachings, maintaining that revivals are the surprising and immediate work of God.

The Arminian revivalism of Timothy Dwight did not understand the sovereign will of God in the traditional manner of salvation. Dwight attempted to persuade people of the theological unity of Calvinism and Wesleyan theology in revivalism, which on reflection can presuppose and imply a human strategy for revivals. Dwight's approach laid the theological foundation for Nathaniel William Taylor, who influenced the theology of Charles G. Finney. As they highlighted human cooperation in salvation, they sought to find something powerful in humanity that they could separate from the work of the Holy Spirit in justification. The question of human decision in revivals boils down to the question of whether God's sovereign grace precludes human effort in justification. In accordance with the emphasis on human ability in revivals, Dwight stressed the power of the will in justification and imputation.

Luther and Calvin established the fundamental doctrines of forensic justification and the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The Reformers sought to avoid the primacy of the human will in salvation. Luther's phrase *sola scriptura* was used to make legitimate points about *sola fide* in justification. And the use of *sola* in Reformation theology was understandable in light of the challenges of the medieval church and Pelagianism, which denied the sovereign grace of God in salvation, leaving us with empty *sola gratia* and *sola fide* in the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Reformation theology had to contend for *iustitia aliena*, "an alien righteousness," as the sole ground on which God pronounces the

wicked righteous. For the Reformers, the primacy of the human will was a mistaken medieval concept of human ability to obtain salvation. Those who held to the primacy of the human will in justification adopted what may be described as an *analytical* view of justification, which found the way of salvation in the indwelling grace of God. This was the view of the medieval church and of Andreas Osiander, who denounced the idea of *iustitia extra nos*, “a righteousness outside of or apart from us.” The formulation of the Reformers was that the *alien* righteousness of Christ is *counted, reckoned, transferred, or imputed* to us by the forensic declaration of God as the sole ground of our justification, while the medieval theologians stressed the infusion of Christ’s righteousness through human meritorious work assisted by indwelling grace as the ground of justification. For Luther and Calvin, the formulation of the medieval church and the Pelagians in justification falsely presupposes the ability of the will to believe in Jesus Christ. More importantly, the Reformers emphasized the correlation between union with Christ and the imputation of Christ’s alien righteousness, and ultimately taught in the doctrines of union and of imputation that God can do what fallen man cannot do.

After considering Reformation theology, we discussed the imputation of Christ’s righteousness as taught by Jonathan Edwards and Timothy Dwight. We saw that Edwards emphasizes *sola gratia* in imputation, while Dwight’s view is deeply rooted in Arminianism. Thus, Edwards supports the great vision of the Reformers to bring the doctrine of forensic justification under the glory of God. He describes God sovereignly and graciously imputing Christ’s righteousness to the wicked through faith alone. However,

Dwight argues that the power of the mind must be presented as the gift of God in salvation, although he calls himself a Calvinist.

Edwards, as we have seen, strongly upholds the sovereign grace of God, not only in justification, but also in the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness. Edwards stresses the necessity for imputed righteousness because of depraved humanity, as taught by the Reformers. It is perhaps significant to note that while Edwards wrote an extensive commentary on human depravity, Dwight does not take human depravity and the crucial relationship between Adam and his posterity seriously. The key point here is that for both Edwards and Dwight, human depravity makes the atonement of Christ necessary. Nevertheless, they understand Christ's atonement differently. Dwight, as a follower of the New Divinity, never speaks of total human depravity in a Calvinistic way. But Edwards, recognizing human depravity, insists that the forensic union between Christ and a person by faith alone is the work of the Holy Spirit, by which the *iustitia aliena*, "the alien righteousness," becomes his by a forensic declaration of God *sola gratia*. In these teachings, his concern is to emphasize the traditional Reformation doctrine of *sola fide–sola gratia*. From this doctrine, he also draws his ideas concerning Adamic and Christological imputation, concluding that union with Adam and union with Christ take place by divine constitution. Edwards draws an important conclusion about forensic union with Christ in relation to the doctrine of election. In his *synthetic* view of justification, union with Christ for the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness is always bound by the divine will. Repudiating the Arminian idea of human autonomy in justification, Edwards recognizes the

exclusiveness of God's sovereign grace in justification, just as the Reformers see a relationship between *sola fide* and *sola gratia* that the Holy Spirit effects through faith.

Dwight's doctrine of justification does not settle the question of how humanity becomes depraved. He never thinks much about it and does not formulate a position on the question. Evidently it is not an issue he considers important to his doctrine of justification. He also seems to have little concern for the greatness of God's free grace in justification. Dwight speaks of God's grace to describe the system of duty in the doctrine of justification, a *synergistic* view, in such a way that regeneration can be obtained by the power of free will. He is unwilling to accept the idea of *sola fide*. In his system of duty, free will is not dependent on the divine will in salvation. For Dwight, the human will does its best job when it uses its own autonomy in regeneration, and then moral union is achieved with Christ. In this respect, moral ability has the distinct purpose of bringing us God's promise of salvation through Christ, and it is moral union that makes Christ's righteousness available to us. Thus, *sola gratia* in Edwards is turned by Dwight into a human duty to obtain the righteousness of Christ. Dwight believes that the system of duty and moral union are interdependent in justification, rather sharply distinguished from the legal union with Christ in Edwards. Dwight's overall argument is that the exercise of the human will is something independent of the activity of the divine will in justification. However, if one starts with such an assumption, it is to be expected that one cannot think of the sovereign grace of God over the act of faith. Nonetheless, Dwight does have a strong doctrine of hereditary depravity. Such a doctrine follows from the New Divinity view of the mediate imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, while Edwards speaks of the immediate

imputation of Adam's sin. However, Dwight's understanding of the imputation of Adam's sin is confused with his idea of hereditary depravity, freedom from which comes in salvation. This confusion in the relationship between Adam and his posterity shatters the entire structure of soteriology, admitting not the slightest shade of the solidaric relationship between Christ and the believer. It is important in his doctrine of justification to affirm that God definitely grants people free will, including the duty of the soul, as a matter of divine constitution. But such an emphasis creates obvious difficulties for the doctrine of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness.

Turning to Korea, by comparison, we find that both the Calvinist Presbyterian and the Arminian Methodist missionaries overwhelmed the Korean churches with the spirit of unity in missions. They eventually adopted a kind of Arminian revivalism, in which revivals became a matter of human preparation, and salvation became human cooperation with the message of the gospel. Calvinist missionaries were quite aware that there were differences in soteriology between these two groups. But their attempt to be united with the Methodist missionaries for the sake of evangelism in Korea made them reluctant to defend their Calvinistic soteriology, especially because these Calvinistic missionaries themselves had been influenced by the revival movement in America before they came to Korea. It is important to note that they did not say negative things about Arminian revivalism. As a result, the Calvinist missionaries were not effectively challenged during their missionary service in Korea to define their terms in revivalism, to explain the theological structure of the doctrine of justification, or to examine their doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Such serious theological compromise fell to the four Korean revivalists.

Sun-Ju Kil was the first one who relates his revival meetings to Arminian revivalism. His revival meetings sparked the Great Revival of 1907, and involved prayer, repentance, witnessing, and songs. In his view, God gives his grace in response to human efforts through prayers during revivals. For Ik-Doo Kim, healings take place by the power of prayer in revivals. Thus, Kim employed prayer, repentance, and healing in his revivals. On his Arminian view, human efforts affect the act of God in salvation that comes subsequent to the act of repentance by virtue of prayer. Yong-Do Lee makes the will of God subordinate to the personal act of prayer in regeneration, even stronger than in Wesleyan theology. Lee often brings this emphasis into his mystical, experience-centered soteriology, especially when comparing the Christian life with the suffering of Jesus Christ. Lastly, Sung-Bong Lee was part of the Holiness revival movement, which emphasized the power of free will in revivals. For Lee, to reject the absolute sovereignty of God leaves no alternative except salvation earned by personal consent to the gospel. Thus, all four Korean revivalists rejected the absolute sovereignty of God, as taught by historic Calvinism, making room for human acts that spring from human autonomous power in salvation.

Ultimately, for Sun-Ju Kil, Arminianism finds a place in his doctrine of justification. Like his concept of revivalism, God's grace is subject to the doctrine of universal atonement. In Kil's thought, the power of freedom can be demonstrated through the act of faith in regeneration. Thus, the act of faith becomes acceptable to God prior to justification. With this unclear doctrine of God's grace, he eventually attributes primacy to human free will. In this respect, Kil reveals defects in his own distinction between justification and sanctification. Certainly, nothing in these constructions justifies the view

that Kil is a follower of the Reformers in the idea of *sola fide*–*sola gratia* in justification. His arguments on the relationship between Adam and his posterity fail to take adequate account of imputation, since he argues that the sins of fallen men are imputed to themselves by their own sinful acts. In light of the Reformers' arguments against the medieval church, it is inadequate for Kil to limit human sin to the sinful acts of individuals. Kil does not supply legitimate arguments for the participation theory of temptation, the theory that free will can be exercised to overcome temptation. Furthermore, for Kil, the act of faith provides the ground for union with Christ. At this point, the imputation of Christ's righteousness takes place by the exercise of faith, but Kil fails to draw a legal union with Christ from the relationship between Christ and believers as described by the Reformers.

For Ik-Doo Kim, the power of prayer is seen as divine grace in his soteriology. Kim believes that fallen man has not lost the power of free will to obtain salvation. He similarly attributes repentance to human ability in dealing with the act of faith, and appears to deny the *sola fide* of the Reformers. The sovereign operation of God's grace becomes secondary in justification: human consent to the gospel precedes the operation of the Holy Spirit in justification. Since he has no concept of the immediate imputation of Adam's sin, Kim also sees no imputation of Christ's righteousness. This formulation leads to the conclusion that nothing can be added to God's glory, yet he makes human beings glorify themselves for salvation. This is similar to the theological problem connected with the forensic doctrine of justification, in which righteousness can be given to the wicked through the act of faith, for there is some ambiguity about the participation of Adam's posterity in his sin, since he deduces the status of humanity simply from the immoral character of this

world. However, this ambiguity poses the same problems when Kim discusses the power of God. Although he vindicates the omnipotence of God in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, he affirms the contradictory position that the will is free to choose salvation through prayer. Kim also teaches union with Christ in relation to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He uses the concept of union with Christ to deny the exclusiveness of *sola gratia* in justification, and then deduces the primacy of the will in justification.

The concept of personal experience is one of Yong-Do Lee's major concerns, and it is the element in his thought that has brought him the most criticism. His doctrine of mystical experience teaches that the act of faith can produce the impartation of Christ's life to the wicked, rather than the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness. On the basis of what he calls the double exchange of life, Lee believes that the righteousness of Christ or the life of Christ can be imparted to the wicked by the exercise of faith through prayer. In his doctrine of justification, Lee describes how human efforts through the act of faith can earn God's favor in justification. An emphasis on strong feeling is found in his discussion of faith, undermining the *sola fide–sola gratia* of the Reformers; there is no statement of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness as the foundation of forensic justification. In the same vein, Lee urges people to have spiritual fellowship (a mystical experience) with Christ, avoiding the Reformers' idea of *sola scriptura*. Lee speaks of the principle of oneness with Christ, but his overall understanding of union with Christ is basically wrong. To speak of "oneness with Christ" without any explanation of the necessity of Christ's righteousness is misleading. The error in his understanding of oneness with Christ turns out

to be essentially an error in his view of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked.

Sung-Bong Lee's account of repentance cannot be reconciled with the Reformation doctrine of man. On the question of God's grace, he teaches that people can cooperate with God by accepting the call of the gospel. Lee speaks of the degree of God's grace to show how the wicked can increase God's grace in salvation. It is not surprising that Lee relates this issue to the self-determining power of the will. For the nature of the will is that the act of faith can accompany God's choice in salvation. God's choice of the elect occurs, but there must be a conditional work of faith from the wicked. By "conditional" Lee means that the free offer of the gospel depends on human decision. Lee is reluctant to accept the *sola fide–sola gratia* terminology, holding that God's acceptance is based on human repentance. When speaking of justification by faith alone, Lee is superior to the other three Korean revivalists. He explains how God puts the robe of the righteousness of Christ on believers. However, he also refers to the robes of love and holiness. He insists on this often enough that we can determine that it is not based on the federal headship of Adam and of Christ. Lee does not use the term *union with Christ* in his discussion of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. By contrast, he uses the term in discussing sanctification. Unlike the Reformers, Lee's understanding of what he calls "union" does not correlate with his understanding of justification.

The most important question addressed by this dissertation is this: Did the two American revivalists and the four Korean revivalists set forth positions on the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness that were in accordance with the Reformation doctrine

of forensic justification by faith alone? This dissertation has shown that the issue of regeneration could be raised in connection with revival and justification. It is important for us to see that for certain historical reasons, regeneration could turn out to be an important theological paradigm of revival, which was inclined to change the forensic justification paradigm.¹ Edwards maintained theological consistency by preserving the Reformation's view of forensic justification, succeeding in keeping its elements together and adding the notion of forensic imputation. But Dwight and the four Koreans were less successful in dealing with the relation between regeneration and justification, even though many of them recognized that they are relevant to each other. Surprisingly, although most of the four Koreans have their own distinctive doctrine of man, some similar emphases on the power of the will in Dwight's theology could be found in their teachings. It is striking, although not surprising, how closely the argument in Sun-Ju Kil's doctrine of original sin paralleled Dwight's language on a partial corruption of human beings. It seems evident that Edwards supplied positive resources for this kind of theological formulation. But Dwight and the four Koreans departed from Reformation theology in greater or lesser extents, formulating their own doctrines of justification.

¹ In his article, "The Ordo Salutis," A. A. Hodge shows the theological tension between justification and regeneration as paradigms: "The clear distinction emphasized between the change of relation to the law, signalized by the word justification; and the real subjective change of personal character, signalized by the words regeneration and sanctification. With the Protestants, justification is a forensic act of God, declaring that the law as a covenant of life is satisfied, and that the subject is no longer subject to its penalty, but entitled henceforth to the rewards conditioned upon obedience. Regeneration on the other hand, is a subjective change in the moral character of the subject, the gracious commencement of his complete restoration to the moral change of God, effected by the Holy Spirit in progressive sanctification." A. A. Hodge, "The Ordo Salutis; Or Relation in the Order of the Nature of Holy Character and Divine Favor," in *Princeton Review* (January-June, 1878), 311.

As we summarize our conclusions, it might prove valuable to remember one of our purposes for this study: to see the importance of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness in theology. Accordingly, this study has shown how the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness could be significant for future dialogue between Roman Catholics and Protestants. The main lesson of this dissertation is that Christians should not give free will room for operation in the doctrine of forensic justification, as that denies the sovereign grace of God and leads to much theological error.

We would like to specify some of the more important characteristics of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, in order to avoid the temptation to see salvation as the elevation of human meritorious works rather than the sovereign grace of God. First, it is crucial to recognize the forensic imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, as that exposes the true status of humanity and the necessity for Christ's righteousness. The medieval church mistakenly attempted to provide for Adam and his posterity the possibility of securing eternal life through their own obedience, leaving *sola fide*—*sola gratia* out of justification.

The second characteristic of the imputation of Christ's righteousness involves a correlation between the doctrine of original sin and the doctrine of faith in justification. Besides the obvious impropriety of employing *synergistic* language when speaking of original sin, one must wonder whether our salvation really should be made dependent upon such an act of faith. The doctrine of faith should express the primacy of God's actions, not advocate the primacy of free will in justification.

We have shown the importance of the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in maintaining a Reformation soteriology. This occurs in the doctrines of forensic justification, limited atonement, *iustitia extra nos* (a righteousness outside of or apart from us), forensic union with Christ, and the federal headship of Adam and of Christ. This study has shown that to construct the doctrine of original sin within a theology of free will is inconsistent with the forensic imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, undermines the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness, and is presumptuous in its speculations. And with respect to the doctrine of forensic justification itself, it is important to maintain the Reformed structure of union with Christ, giving no place to any meritorious work of any indwelling grace in fallen humanity prior to justification. We have seen that the Reformed view of legal union with Christ fits together closely with the Reformed view of the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness to the wicked. We also should not miss that *sola fide–sola gratia*, connected with the sovereignty of God in justification, vindicates the idea of *solī Deo gloria* in salvation.

The Locus of Justification by Faith Alone

This present study has indicated that there was the decline of Calvinistic revivalism both in the nineteenth century America and in the twentieth century Korea. Significantly, what holds our attention here is the growth of Arminian revivalism in two different cultures, which is still so strong and yet so effective today. What remains is a fundamental question about how the Calvinistic theology degenerates into American nineteenth century “evangelical” revivalism and Korean twentieth century “union” revivalism. Generally, Christians often wonder how they can deal with the spirit of “unity” in order for them not to

be separated from one another in Jesus Christ.² There were various motives to develop a new revivalism in these two countries.

First, the eighteenth century Awakening brought in a “new style of emotional intensity” to American Calvinist tradition.³ Secondly, the rise of a new revivalism (the New School) in connection with the theology of Finney did not discard *intellect*, which was a favorite theme in Reformed circles, but created “new channels for emphasis on emotion throughout American evangelism.”⁴ Thirdly, American Calvinist theology since the first Great Awakening could be easily blended with Moody’s revivalistic movement by his “pietistic” Arminianism.⁵

The new revivalist movement arose in Korea in the atmosphere which American Methodist and Presbyterian missionaries, who had the sense of a new revivalism and millenarianism, helped shape union movement, while ecumenical union movement in America was mostly led by Americans. In Korea, this new revivalism with prayer movement and holiness movement went unchallenged, and its influence still does exist.⁶ Today, however, Edwards’s Calvinistic revivalism does exist in Reformed circles in

² Alec Vidler calls this a “growing conviction” in the whole world. Alec R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present Day* (New York: Penguin Books, 1961), 262.

³ George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelism 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 44.

⁴ Ibid., 45. Cf. Ibid., 3-8, 30-39.

⁵ Ibid., 46. The most enthusiastic and influential Arminians such as Charles Finney and D. L. Moody contributed more a new revivalism than did Calvinists.

⁶ Today ecumenical union movement is going on in Korea, but it is not very successful. Myung-Hyuk Kim, *The 18 Issues of Korean Church: Its History and Potentiality* (Seoul: Kyujang Media Mission, 1998), 350-68.

Korea.⁷ In these Reformed circles, there is also a growing tendency that they should regain the idea of Calvin's transforming the culture.

Who does not hope for a better world, especially when one lives in a chaotic world? We need not deny that brutal Japanese Imperialism and the Korean War in the twentieth century helped Koreans in their desire to desperately restore their safe world. Christ could give them hope in their hopeless world. Would such faith in Jesus Christ set them free from the horrible world? The gospel appeared to be optimistic about God's works in these cruel circumstances. With respect to the gospel, thus, for Koreans, the answer for a better world was not a dogmatic issue for a millennial kingdom. Rather, it was delivering the good news that liberates from a hopeless world and restores hope in Jesus Christ. We can easily understand that under these circumstances they would not be naturally interested in human inability and justification by faith alone. Or perhaps shame culture rather than guilt culture might be an additional factor in the Korean uneasiness with a full-blown theology of justification, since justification is about the removal of guilt and Asian culture is much more shame oriented than guilt oriented.⁸ Probably, the analysis of Alec R. Vidler might be helpful in understanding their disinterest in human inability and justification:

This whole development [union movement in the world] revealed the need for a new kind of theology for the laity, which would illuminate the problems that actually press upon men and women who have to cope with the life of the contemporary world. Traditional and conventional theology seemed now to have been far too much

⁷ Ibid., 328-38. Edwards's theology has many first cousins in evangelical Christians: Baptists, Presbyterians, and some other evangelicals. Today it is regaining the influence of Edwards's Calvinistic revivalism in Korea.

⁸ In *Beyond Identity*, Richard Keyes compares the moral stance of guilt issues with the model orientation of shame questions. Dick Keyes, *Beyond Identity: Finding Your Self in the Image and Character of God* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1984), 44-46, 52, 52-54, 90-92.

dominated by purely ecclesiastical and clerical interests, and to have been fabricated by men who had only a remote acquaintance with what was actually going on at the centres and growing point of power.⁹

This study presents that we must not always be too optimistic about preaching the doctrine of total depravity and the imputation of Christ's righteousness, because we must deal with saving people who live in a society that has its deep root in the culture of *self-respect* or *self-praise*. If we lose the connection between theology and the principles of our society, we will lose the ground for evangelistic efforts in our society.¹⁰ In other words, if we always emphasize *only* one side of a coin (*only* God's grace alone and total depravity), neglecting our situational circumstances, we can miss the purpose of God's creation and lose the precious value of *one soul* in Jesus Christ.

Until very recently, many Reformed scholars felt uncomfortable by the presence of human responsibility in their classical theologians and pastors. Often they have dealt with anxiety either by attempting to deny that the idea is really present, or by arguing that it is not part of a true Reformation theology. They believe that the doctrine of justification ought to be limited to God's grace, not even looking for the manifestations of human responsibility in Reformation thought, probably because they have assumed that it must not be there. The Reformers, after all, stress God's sovereignty only and not human responsibility. What this study indicates is that Edwards in particular is often

⁹ Vidler, 263-64.

¹⁰ Perhaps, it might be helpful to quote John Frame's comment on the task of theology: "the task of theology is not to reorganize Scripture into some kind of ideally perfect order for *all* occasions but to *apply* Scripture, arranging its presentation to meet the needs of a *particular* audience." John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P. & R. Publishing Co., 1987), 184 (italics not added). He also defines theology as "the application of God's Word by persons to all areas of life." *Ibid.*, 76.

misunderstood as a rigorous theologian who did not have the sense of human responsibility. In short, some theologians have tended to disregard it in Calvinistic revivalism either as nonexistent or as a disagreement.

Given that, I hope that this study has shown that nothing could be further from the truth. Slowly but surely, the point has been regaining through recent scholarship that theology helps us affirm the world in the establishing of its society or that it is able to provide the practical pattern for transforming its culture. If nothing else, I hope that this study will help Roman Catholics cooperate with evangelicals together for unity. In this age, Roman Catholics and evangelicals alike should be able to turn to the writings of the Reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin and draw the richness of *sola gratia* in justification from them. Furthermore, either Roman Catholic and evangelical dialogue or Calvinistic and Arminian dialogue can only benefit from the insight that we share a significant Reformation heritage, which we have had in common from the Reformation doctrine of forensic justification. As theologians begin to listen to one another and discover a sincere appreciation of one another's insights and evangelistic efforts, they are acknowledging that what unites us is far more convincing than what divides us. We might observe that until recently, the greatest peril of many debates about the Reformation is the attempt to establish dogmatic issues on the reality of God's sovereignty only and not to find the *locus* of human responsibility in this world.¹¹

¹¹ As Marsden rightly concludes in his *Fundamentalism*, we must note that the "history of Christianity reveals a perplexing mixture of divine and human efforts." Marsden, 229.

My own research in the doctrine of justification by faith alone has led me to the conclusion that evangelistic effort with the love of God is perhaps a better starting point than dogmatics for fruitful dialogue today. This is not to say that dogmatic issues are not important; only they need to be seen, as Calvin himself would eagerly say, in the context of a Christian life.¹²

Having allowed Calvin to speak to us in our contemporary world, we must note that many Christians find themselves coming together today in ways that overcome denominational differences. Fortunately, today Calvinists and Arminians find themselves working side by side in relieving the needy and working to transform their society. Perhaps many Christians go a step ahead of many theologians in their concern of what is most important in their contemporary culture. Gratefully, Christians in both America and Korea seem to be slowly getting this message, which stresses the primacy of evangelistic efforts in the construction of a theological worldview.

I would like to conclude with a brief suggestion: we should not underestimate the *value* of human beings in any case, since *only* human beings (the climax of the creation) are created in the image of God and that image of God is *not totally destroyed* even after the

¹² In a similar sense, John Frame warns against one-sided emphasis on the primacy of the *intellect* in theology: "I believe this concept [the primacy of the intellect] has also encouraged an unfortunate intellectualism in some Reformed circles. In those circles, sanctification, guidance, worship, preaching, discipleship, counseling, and ministerial preparation have often been too easily and closely assimilated to the model of academic learning. Cultivating godly emotions and ministering to the emotional needs of people, even the development of pastoral skills, have often been neglected—and even treated with a kind of smug concept." John M. Frame, *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P. & R. Publishing Co., 1995), 148. It is advisable for us to use the concept (the primacy of the intellect) when liberal and neo-orthodox theologians challenge us with their denial of "any propositional or intellectual element in revelation," leaving us with "empty feeling." Ibid. He continues to argue that Reformed theologians have to compete with "various kinds of emotionalism within evangelicalism." Ibid. I believe that Jonathan Edwards had this kind of insight in his theology.

Fall. If we neglect people (or society) or their interest to seek freedom, forgiveness, hope in a hopeless world, success, and prosperity, we will lose opportunities to introduce the doctrine of forensic justification by faith alone or Reformation theology to our society. And this is all about the gospel invitation. It is an invitation to be *a new creation* in Jesus Christ by faith alone through Christ alone by God's grace alone. This must be preached with the love of God shown through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the basis of justification by faith alone. Therefore, why don't we give them hope in God's love, hope in *union* with Christ (justification and sanctification), hope to be *a new creation* in Jesus Christ, and hope in the exercise of human responsibility in God's sovereignty when we present the good news, the gospel? In the revivalists examined, we have found that we have nothing to lose from continuing to find the richness of these Reformers and Edwards in our dialogue, especially their profound appreciation of the meaning of union with Christ and the imputation of Christ's righteousness *sola gratia*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Allison, C. F. *The Rise of Moralism*. London: S. P. C. K., 1966.
- Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Armstrong, John H. *Preparing for True Revival When God Moves*. Eugene: Harvest House Publishers, 1998.
- Augustine, *On Nature and Grace*. In *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Bae, Hong-Il. "The Life and Thought of Younggye Kil Sun-Ju Kil Mocksa." Th. M. thesis, Korean Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 1995.
- Bainton, Roland H. *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. 1952. Reprint, Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.
- Barker, William. *Puritan Profiles: 54 Puritans: Personalities Drawn Together by the Westminster Assembly*. Ross-shire: Great Britain, 1996.
- Bass, Clarence B. *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism: Its Historical Genesis and Ecclesiastical Implications*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Bavinck, Herman. *Our Reasonable Faith: A Survey of Christian Doctrine*. Translated by Henry Zylstra. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
- Beker, J. Christian. *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul's Thought*. Translated by Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Bellamy, Joseph. *True Religion Delineated, or Experimental Religion as distinguished from formality and enthusiasm*. Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1850.
- _____. *The Works of Joseph Bellamy*. 2 Vols. Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1853. Reprint, New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1987.

- Berk, Stephen E. *Calvinism Versus Democracy: Timothy Dwight and the Origins of American Evangelical Orthodoxy*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1974.
- Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *Faith and Sanctification*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1952.
- _____. *Faith and Perseverance*. Translated by Robert D. Knudsen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958.
- _____. *Divine Election*. Translated by Hugo Bekker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960.
- _____. *Faith and Justification*. Translated by Lewis B. Smedes. 1954. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963.
- _____. *Studies in Dogmatics: Holy Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.
- _____. *Sin*. Translated by Philip C. Holtrop. 1971. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980.
- _____. *The Providence of God*. Translated by Lewis B. Smedes. 1954. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.
- Blumhofer, Edith D. and Randall Balmer, eds. *Modern Christian Revivals*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Bogue, Carl W. *Jonathan Edwards and the Covenant of Grace*. Cherry Hill, NJ: Mack Publishing Co., 1975.
- Boardman, George Nye. *A History of New England Theology*. New York: A. D. F. Randolph Co., 1899.
- Bonar, Horatius. *God's Way of Peace: A Book for the Anxious*. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1866.
- _____. *Words to Winners of Souls*. 1950. Reprint, Oradell, NJ: American Tract Society, 1966.
- _____. *How Shall I Go To God?*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.

- _____. *God's Way of Holiness*. Chicago: The Moody Press, n. d.
- _____. *The Everlasting Righteousness*. 1874. Reprint, Hobbs, NM: The Trinity Foundation, 1994.
- Boyer, Paul. *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Braaten, Carl E., and Robert W. Jenson, eds. *Union with Christ: The New Finnish Interpretation of Luther*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Bright, John. *The Kingdom of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1963.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. *An Introduction to the Theology of Karl Barth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979.
- Brooks, Thomas. *Heaven on Earth: A Treatise on Christian Assurance*. 1654. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: 1961.
- Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.
- Brown, George T. *Mission to Korea*. New York: Board of World Missions, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 1962.
- Buchanan, James. *The Doctrine of Justification: An Outline of Its History in the Church and of Its Exposition from Scripture*. 1867. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1955; London: Banner of Truth, 1961.
- _____. *The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit*. 1843. Reprint, Edinburgh, Scotland: Banner of Truth, 1996.
- Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress: Works*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1991.
- Burns, J. Patout, ed. and trans. *Theological Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Buswell, J. Oliver. *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Byun, Jong-Ho, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Ilki* [The diaries of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Vol. 3. Seoul: Simuwon, 1953.

- _____. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksachun: Shinsaengkwan* [The biography of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Seoul: Simuwon, 1973.
- _____. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Samoohshipyon* [Admiration for the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for half century]. Vol. 7. Seoul: Sungkwang Munwhasa, 1981.
- _____, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Seoganjip* [The letters of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Seoul: Sungkwang Munwhasa, 1982.
- _____, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Yeonkoo Sashipyon* [The study of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for forty years]. Vol. 4. Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986.
- _____, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Shinhack* [The theology of faith in the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Vol. 6. Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986.
- _____, ed. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Chungip: Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Yeonkoo Banseki* [The study of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee for half a century]. Vol. 8. Seoul: Chosuck Publishing Co., 1986.
- _____, ed. *Yong-Do Lee Chungip* [The writings of Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. 10 vols. Seoul: Jangan Munwhasa, 1993.
- Calvin, John. *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- _____. *Calvin's Commentaries*. 22 Vols. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. *Instruction In Faith*. Translated by Paul T. Fuhrmann. 1977. Reprint, Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- _____. *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*. Audubon, NJ: Old Paths Publications, 1994.
- _____. *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will*. Translated by G. I. Davies. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.
- Campbell, J. McLeod. *The Nature of the Atonement*. 1856. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.
- Carpentor, Joel A., and Wilbert R. Shenk, eds. *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- _____. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Carson, D. A., ed. *Right With God: Justification in the Bible and in the World*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Chantry, Walter. *Today's Gospel: Authentic or Synthetic?*. 1979. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1989.
- Chawick, Henry. *The Early Church: The Story of Emergent Christianity from the Apostolic Age to the Foundation of the Church of Rome*. 1967. Reprint, New York: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Chamberlain, Ava. "Self-Deception as a Theological Problem in Jonathan Edwards' 'Treatise Concerning Religious Affections.'" *Church History* 63 (1994): 541-56.
- Cherry, Conrad. "The Puritan Notion of the Covenant in Jonathan Edwards' Doctrine of Faith." *Church History* 34 (1965): 328-41.
- _____. *The Theology of Jonathan Edwards: A Reappraisal*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1966.
- _____. *Nature and Religious Imagination: From Edwards to Bushnell*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Cho, David C. "The Old Princeton Presbyterian Response to the Holiness Movement." Ph. D. diss. Westminster Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Choi, Hyun. *Dae Boohuingsa* [The great revivalist]. Seoul: Jerusalem Press, 2000.
- Chonkyo Shibo* [Religious times]. 14 January 1936.
- Choo, Chai-Yong. *A History of Christian Theology in Korea*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1998.
- Chung, Hack-Jin. "The Life and Literary World of Lee Yong-Do: Overcoming the Conflict and Disruption and Looking Forward to the Unity." Th. M. thesis, Korean Methodist Theological Seminary, 1966.
- Chung, In-Kyo. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksaui Sangaewa Sulkyo: Kyui Buhungsulkyoae Daehan Sulkyohackchuck Bunsuck* [The life and sermons of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee: A homiletical analysis on the sermons of revival]. Seoul: Handle Publishing Co., 1998.
- Chung, Jin. "Lee Yong-Doui Kyohoebipanul Tonghan Hyun Kyohoejock Sangawhangui Jaejomung [A study on the present state of church with the criticism of Lee Yong-Do on church]." Th. M. thesis, Korean Methodist Theological Seminary, 1992.

- Chung, Se-Ju. "*Iljeha Jongmal Jaerim Shinangui Minjockkyowhoesajuk Wheechi Yeonkoo* [Studies on eschatology of the Korean church history under the rule of Japanese Imperialism]." Th. M. thesis, Yonsei Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Chung, Sung-Kuh. *Hankukkyohoe Sulkyosa* [A history of preaching in the Korean church]. Seoul: The Presbyterian General Assembly Theological Seminary Press, 1986.
- _____. "Kil Sun-Ju Mocksau Samkwa Sulkyo [The life and sermon of Rev. Kil Sun-Ju]." *Walgan Mockhoe* (February 1988): 115-22.
- _____. *Korean Church and Reformed Faith: Focusing on the Historical Study of Preaching in the Korean Church*. Seattle, WA: Time Printing, 1996.
- Clark, Allen D. *A History of the Church in Korea*. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1971.
- _____. *Protestant Missionaries in Korea, 1893-1983*. Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1987.
- Clark, N. Donald. *Christianity in Modern Korea*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986.
- Clowney, Edmund P. *The Unfolding Mystery: Discovering Christ in the Old Testament*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 1988.
- _____. *The Church*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Conforti, Joseph A. *Jonathan Edwards, Religious Tradition, & American Culture*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Conn, Harvie M. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline (I)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29 (November 1966): 24-58.
- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline (II)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29 (May 1967): 136-78.
- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline (III)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 30 (November 1967): 24-49.
- _____. "Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church: An Historical Outline (IV)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29 (May 1968): 135-84.
- _____. "Korean Theology—Where It Has Been? Where Is It Going?" *The Presbyterian Theological Review* 39:2 (Summer 1972): 52-82.

- _____. *Contemporary World Theology*. Phillisburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1973.
- _____. "Haebanghuui Hankukjannokyo Bosushinhack [Korean Presbyterian conservatism since liberation]." *Shin Hack Jinam* 42:3 (Autumn 1975): 46-45.
- _____. "Conversion and Culture: A Theological Perspective with Reference to Korea." In *Gospel and Culture*, ed. John Stott and Robert T. Coote, 195-235. Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1979.
- _____. "Haebangshinhackkwa Sanghwangwha (II) [Liberation theology and contextualization]." *Shin Hack Jinam* 49:3 (Autumn 1982): 6-21.
- _____, ed. *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
- _____. *Studies in the Theology of the Korean Presbyterian Church*. Seoul: The Korea Society for Reformed Faith and Action, 1997.
- Conroy, Hilary. *The Japanese Seizure of Korea: 1868-1910*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.
- Cragg, Gerald R. *The Church and the Age of Reason: 1648-1789*. Baltimore: Penguin Books Ltd, 1960.
- Cranz, F. Edwards. *An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law, and Society*. Mifflintown, PA: Sigler Press, 1998.
- Crawford, Michael J. *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in Its British Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Cross, F. L. and E. A. Livingstone, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Cunningham, Charles. *Timothy Dwight 1752-1817: A Biography*. New York: Macmillan, 1942.
- Davis, Horton. *The Worship of the English Puritans*. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publication, 1997.
- Dayton, Donald W. *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- _____, and Robert K. Johnston, eds. *The Variety of American Evangelism*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

De Prosopo, R. C. *Theism in the Discourse of Jonathan Edwards*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1985.

Dieter, Melvin E. *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press Inc., 1966.

Dillstone, F. W. *The Christian Understanding of Atonement*. London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1968.

Dollar, George W. *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. Greenville, SC: Bob Johns University Press, 1973.

Drummond, Henry. *Dwight L. Moody: Impressions and Facts*. New York: McClure, Phillips, 1900.

Dwight, Timothy. *Theology Explained and Defended*. 4 Vols. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1863.

_____. *Thoughts Of And For the Inner Life*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1899.

Edgar, William. *Reasons of the Heart: Rediscovering Christian Persuasion*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996.

Edwards, Jonathan. *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*. general editor, Harry Stout. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957-:

Volume 1: *Freedom of the Will*, ed. Paul Ramsey, 1957.

Volume 2: *Religious Affections*, ed. John Smith, 1959.

Volume 3: *Original Sin*, ed. Clyde Holbrook, 1970.

Volume 4: *Great Awakening*, ed. C. C. Goen, 1972.

Volume 5: *Apocalyptic Writings*, ed. Stephen Stein, 1977.

Volume 6: *Scientific and Philosophical Writings*, ed. W. E. Anderson, 1980.

Volume 7: *The Life of David Brainerd*, ed. Norman Pettit, 1985.

Volume 8: *Ethical Writings*, ed. Paul Ramsey, 1989.

Volume 9: *A History of the Work of Redemption*, ed. John Wilson, 1989.

Volume 10: *Sermons and Discourses, 1720-1723*, ed. Wilson Kimnach, 1992.

Volume 11: *Typological Writings*, ed. Wallace Anderson, ed. al. 1993.

Volume 12: *Ecclesiastical Writings*, ed. David Hall, 1994.

Volume 13: *The "Miscellanies," a-500*, ed. Thomas Schafer, 1994.

Volume 14: *Sermons and Discourses, 1723-1729*, ed. Kenneth P. Minkema, 1996.

Volume 15: *Notes on Scripture*, ed. Stephen J. Stein, 1998.

Volume 16: *Letters and Personal Writings*, ed. George S. Claghorn, 1998.

Volume 17: *Sermons and Discourses, 1730-1733*, ed. Mark Valeri, 1999.

Volume 18: *The "Miscellanies," 501-832*, ed. Wilson Kimnach, 2000.

- _____. *Treatise on Grace: and Other Posthumously Published Writings*. Cambridge & London: James Clark & Co. Ltd., 1971.
- _____. *The Works of Jonathan Edwards with a memoir by Sereno E. Dwight*. ed. Edward Kickman. 2 Vols. 1834. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1990.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. *The Holy Spirit*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966.
- _____. *The Christian Life: A Doctrinal Introduction*. 1981. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1989.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B., D. F. Wright, and J. I. Packer, eds. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988.
- Fiering, Norman. *Moral Philosophy at Seventeenth-Century Harvard: A Discipline in Tradition*. Williamsburg, VA: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- _____. *Jonathan Edwards' Moral Thought and Its British Context*. Williamsburg, VA: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Finney, Charles. *Finney's Systematic Theology*. Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1976.
- _____. *Revivals of Religion*. Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.
- First Things*. May 1994, January 1998.
- Forde, Gerhard O. *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Foster, Hugh Frank. *The Modern Movement in American Theology: Sketches in the History of American Theology*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1939.
- _____. *A Genetic History of the New England*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987.
- Frame, John. *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1987.
- _____. *Apologetics to the Glory of God: An Introduction*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1994.
- _____. *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 1995.

- Gaffin Jr., Richard B. *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1987.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. *The Great Awakening*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Gerrish, B. A., ed. *Reformers in Profile*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Gerstner, John. *Steps to Salvation: The Evangelical Message of Jonathan Edwards*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- _____. *The Rational Biblical Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. 3 Vols. Orlando, FL: Ligonier Ministries, 1991-1993.
- _____. "Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Edwards on the Bondage of the Will," In *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will: Historical and Theological Perspective on Calvinism*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Godfrey, William Robert. "Tensions with International Calvinism: The Debate on the Atonement and the Synod of Dort, 1618-1619." Ph. D. diss. Stanford University, 1974.
- Goen, C. C. *Revivalism and Separatism in New England, 1740-1800: Strict Congregationalists and Separate Baptists in the Great Awakening*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.
- Gritsch, Eric W., ed. *Martin Luther: Faith in Christ and the Gospel*. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1996.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.
- Guelzo, Allen C. *Edwards on the Will: A Century of American Theological Debate*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.
- Han, Chun-Kun. *Chuckjiannun Soonkyoja Kim Ik-Doo* [A never dying martyr, Ik-Doo Kim]. Seoul: Sungseo Shinhackseowon, 1995.
- Han, Soong-Hong. *Hankuk Sinhacksasangui Heureum* [The stream of Korean theological thought]. Seoul: Korea Presbyterian Theological College Press, 1996.
- Han, Woo-Keun. *The History of Korea*. Translated by Kyung Sik Lee. Seoul: Eul Yoo Publishing Co., 1970.

- Hannah, John D. "The Doctrine of Original Sin in Postrevolutionary America." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 134 (1977): 238-56.
- Hardman, Keith J. *Seasons of Refreshing: Evangelism and Revivals in America*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.
- Hart, D. G., and John Muether. *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. Philadelphia: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995.
- _____, and Sean Michael Lucas, eds. *The Legacy of Jonathan Edwards: American Religion and the Evangelical Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Hatch, O. Nathan, ed. *Jonathan Edwards & the American Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- _____. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Haroutunian, J. *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of New England Theology*. New York: H. Holt, 1964.
- Heimert, Alan and Miller Perry, eds. *The Great Awakening: Documents Illustrating the Crisis and Its Consequences*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.
- Hodge, A. A. "The Ordo Salutis; Or Relation in the Order of Nature of Holy Character and Divine Favor." *Princeton Reviews* (January-June, 1878): 304-21.
- _____. *The Confession of Faith*. 1869. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1992.
- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. 3 Vols. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989.
- Hoekema, Anthony A. *The Bible and the Future*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- _____. *Saved By Grace*. 1989. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1994.
- Hong, Chi-Mo. "Hankukkyowhoe Bunpawundong [Separatist movement in the Korean church]." *Shin Hack Jinam* 47:1 (Spring 1980): 26-38.
- _____. "Faith and Theology of Early Korean Missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A." *Christian Thought* 26 (February 1982): 37-47.

- _____. "Hankuk Choki Sonkyosadului Singanakwa Sinhak [The faith and theology of early missionaries to Korea]." *Presbyterian Theological Quarterly* 51 (March-June 1984): 128-39.
- Hopkins, Samuel. *The Works of Samuel Hopkins*. 3 Vols. Boston: Doctrinal Tract & Book Society, 1852-1854. Reprint, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1987.
- Horton, Michael S. *A Christian View of Culture and Your Role in It: Where in the World Is the Church?*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1995.
- Huh, Gin. *Hankuk Kyoheoeui Buheung Undongae Daehan Yeongu* [A study of the revivalism movements of the Korean church]. Seoul: Theological Fund Conference, 1980.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. *Protestant America*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1969.
- Hulse, Erroll. *Give Him No Rest: A Call to Prayer for Revival*. Darlington, County Durham, England: Evangelical Press, 1991.
- Hunt, Everett N., Jr. *Protestant Pioneers in Korea*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1980.
- Hunter, James Davison. *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983.
- _____. *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Huntley, Martha. *Caring, Growing, Changing: A History of the Protestant Mission in Korea*. New York: Friendship Press, 1984.
- Husbands, Mark, and Daniel J. Treier, eds. *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Hutchinson, George P. *The Problem of Original Sin in American Presbyterian Theology*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1971.
- Hutchinson, William R. *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Im, Taek-Kwon, ed. *Yijuckjungmyung* [Proofs of miracles]. Seoul: Yasochoseowon, 1921.
- Jenson, Robert W. *America's Theologian: A Recommendation of Jonathan Edwards*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

- Jenkins, Michael. *A Comparative Study in the Theology of Atonement in Jonathan Edwards & John McLeod Campbell: Atonement & the Character of God*. San Francisco, CA: Mellen Research University Press, 1993.
- Jones, Peter. *Spirit Wars*. Escondido, CA: Main Entry Editions, 1997.
- Jones, R. T. "Reformation Theology," In *New Dictionary of Theology*. eds. Sinclair Ferguson & David Wright. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988.
- Joo, Seung-Joong. "The Early Protestant Missionaries' Preaching in the Korean Church: 1884-1934." Th. M. thesis, Columbia Theological Seminary, 1991.
- Ju, Jae-Yong. "Hankuk Kyohoe Buheung Ungdongeui Sajukbipan" [A historical critique of the Revival Movement in the Korean church]. *Christian Thought* 23:6 (September 1987).
- Kang, Il-Koo & Kim, Yeon-Tae, eds. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksaui Buhungwundong Chomyung* [A theological reflection on the revival movement of the Rev. Sung-Bong Lee]. Seoul: Word of Life Book, 2000.
- Kang, Wi-Jo. *Religion and Politics in Korea under the Japanese Rule*. New York: Edwin Muellen Press, 1987.
- _____. *Christ and Caesar in Modern Korea: A History of Christianity and Politics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Keys, Dick. *Beyond Identity: Finding Yourself in the Image and Character of God*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1984.
- Kidock Kyobo* [Korean Christian journal]. January-April 1936, May-December 1937, February-December 1938.
- Kil, Jin-Kyung. *Younggye Kil Sun-Ju Moksa Yoogo Sunjip* [Collected posthumous works of Sun-Jun Kil]. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1968.
- Kil, Sun-Ju. *Hataron* [Indolence]. Seoul: Daehan Sungseohoe, 1904.
- _____. *Malsaeron* [The doctrine of last things]. Kyungsung: Kangdaesa, 1935.
- _____. *Kil Sun-Ju Moksa Junjip* [Collected writings of Rev. Sun-Ju Kil]. Seoul: Christian Literture Society, 1968.
- _____. *Kil Sun-Ju Mocksasulkyo: Daniel Sakyungan* [Sermons]. Seoul: Hyemunsa, 1969.

- _____. *Kil Sun-Ju Mocksasulkyo: Kangdaebogam* [Sermons]. Seoul: Hyemunsa, 1969.
- Kim, Byung-Suh. *A History of the Growth of Christianity in Korea*. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1971.
- Kim, C. I., and Doretha E. Mortimore, eds. *Korea's Response to Japan: The Colonial Period, 1910-1945*. Kalamazoo: Center for Korean Studies, Western Michigan University, 1977.
- Kim, Hae-Yon. *Hankukkydockyohoesa* [A history of Korean church]. Seoul: Sungji Publishing Company, 1999.
- Kim, Ik-Doo. *The Sermons of Rev. Ik-Doo Kim*. Seoul: Sung-Kwang Munwhsa, 1976.
- _____. *Kim Ik-Doo Mocksa Sulkyo* [The sermons of Rev. Ik-Doo Kim]. Seoul: Haemoonsa, 1969.
- Kim, In-Soo. "A Study on the Rev. Kil Sun Ju's Sprit of Country—Love." *Christian and Theology* Volume 24 (1992): 207-229.
- _____. "Hankukui Yongjock Balhungkirulbonda [A look at the spiritual development in Korea]." *Mockhoewa Shinhack* (April 1994): 59-66.
- _____. "The Rev. Sun-Ju Kil's Life and Preaching." *Church and Theology* Volume 26 (1994): 56-79.
- _____. *History of the Christian Church in Korea*. Seoul: Presbyterian College & Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Kim, John T. *Protestant Church Growth in Korea*. Belleville, Canada: Essence Publishing, 1996.
- Kim, Ki-Bum. "Kil Sun-Juui Buhung Wundong [The revival movement of Kil Sun-Ju]." Th. M. thesis, Han Shin Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Kim, Min-Yong. *A History of the Korean Church*. Seoul: The Korea Society for Reformed Faith and Action, 2001.
- Kim, Myung-Hyuk. *The Eighteen Hot Issues of Korean Church: Its History and Potentiality*. Seoul: Kyujang Media Mission, 1998.
- Kim, Nam-Shik, and Harvie M. Conn. *Hankuk Jangrokkyo Shinhak Sasangsa*, 1 [A history of theological thought in the Korean Presbyterian Church, Vol. 1]. Seoul: Bethany Book House, 1977.

- Kim, Yang-Sun. *Hankuk Kidokkyosa Yeongu* [A study of the history of the Korean church]. Seoul: Kidok Kyomunsa, 1971.
- Kim, Yon-Sam. "A Study on the Sermons of Lee Yong-Do." Th. M. thesis, Han Shin Theological Seminary,
- Kim, Young-Jae. "The Problem of the Korean Church." *Shin Hack Jinam* 52:4 (Winter 1985): 7-16.
- Kistler, Do, ed. *Justification by Faith Alone: Affirming the Doctrine by Which the Church & the Individual Stands or Falls*. Morgan, PA: Solio Deo Gloria Publications, 1995.
- Kraus, C. Norman. *Dispensationalism in American: Its Rise and Development*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958.
- Kuiper, R. B. *The Glorious Body of Christ*. 1967. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christianity*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.
- Lee, Jung-Kuk. "An Analysis of Rev. Kil Sun-Ju's Life in the Light of William James' Typology." Th. M. thesis, Kang Nam Theological Seminary, 1998.
- Lee, Jung-Young. "The American Missionary Movement in Korea, 1882-1945: Its Contributions and American Diplomacy." *Missiology* 11 (October 1983): 387-462.
- Lee, Man-Yeul. *Hankuk Kidokkyowa Minjokuisik* [Korean Christianity and the national consciousness]. Seoul: Jisiksanupsa, 1991.
- Lee, Sang-Duck. "Kil Sun-Ju, Lee Yong-Doui Buhungwundong Bikyoyonkuwa Yiwundongyi Minjockkyohoehyungsunge Michin Younghyang [A comparative study on revival movement between Kil Sun-Ju and Lee Yong-Do, and its influence on the formative period of the Korean church]." Th. M. thesis, Korean Methodist Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Lee, Sang-Kyu. *A Century of Calvin Studies in Korea, 1884-1984*. Seoul: Korean Society for Reformed Faith and Action, 1985.
- Lee, Sang-Bok. *Asian Thought and Culture: A Comparative Study between Minjung Theology and Reformed Theology from a Missiological Perspective*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.

Lee, Sung-Bong. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 1: Autobiography: Mallo Mothamyun Juckumnuro* [With death if not possible with words]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993.

_____. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 2: Sarangui Kangdan* [Sermons: love pulpit]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993.

_____. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 3: Immanuel Kangdan* [Sermons: Immanuel pulpit]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993.

_____. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 4: Buhungui Bigyul* [Sermons: the secret of revivals]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993.

_____. *Lee Sung-Bong Mocksa Series No. 5: Chunro Yeukjung Kangdan* [Sermons on the pilgrimage]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1993.

Lee, Yong-Do. *Lee Yong-Do Mocksa Kul Moum: Semuon* [Collected writings of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. ed. Yesoo Kyuhoe. Seoul: Dasan Kulbang, 1993.

Lee Yong-Do Shinang and Sasang Yeonkuhoe [Lee Yong-Do Faith and Thought Studies], ed. *Spirituality and Yesoo Movement of Lee Yong-Do Mocksa* [Spirituality and Jesus movement of Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Seoul: Sungseo Yeonkusa, 1998.

Lee Yong-Doi Sangae, Shinhack, Yongsung [The life, theology, and spirituality of the Rev. Yong-Do Lee]. Seoul: Handl Publishing Publishing Co., 2001.

Lee, Young-Hoon. "The Holy Spirit Movement in Korea: Its Historical and Doctrinal Development," Ph. D. diss., Temple University, 1966.

Lee, Yong-Hun. *The History of the Korean Church*. Seoul: Concordia Press, 1978.

Lee, Young-Kun. *Jesu* [Jesus]. 2 Vols. Seoul: Yesukyohoe Konguihoe, 1993.

Letham, Robert. *The Work of Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Lindberg, Carter, ed. *The European Reformations Sourcebook*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000.

Livingstone, E. A., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Lloyd-Jones, D. Martyn. *Revival*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1987.

Logan, Samuel T. "The Doctrine of Justification in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984): 26-52.

- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works: Sermons on the Gospel of St. John Chapters 1-4*. Translated by Martin H. Bertram. Vol. 22. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1957.
- _____. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publishings, 1976.
- _____. *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. ed. Timothy F. Lull. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Bondage of the Will*. Translated by J. I. Packer & O. R. Johnston. 1957. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1997.
- _____. *Commentary on Galatians: Modern English Version*. Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1999.
- MacArthur, John F. *Reckless Faith: When the Church Loses Its Will to Discern*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- _____. *Christianity and Liberalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- _____. *The Christian View of Man*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1937.
- Magnuson, Norris A., and William G. Travis. *American Evangelism: An Annotated Bibliography*. West Cornwell, CN: Locust Hill Press, 1990.
- Marini, Stephen A. *Radical Sects of Revolutionary New England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelism, 1870-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Reforming Fundamental: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- _____. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. *Jonathan Edwards: A Life*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Marty, Martin E. *Religious Empire: The Protestant Experience in America*. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

- Matts, Mark C. *The Role of Justification in Contemporary Theology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- McCoy, Charles S., and Baker, J. Wayne. *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1991.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 2 Vols. Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- _____. *Justification by Faith: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988.
- _____. *Justification by Faith: What It Means For Us Today*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
- _____. *Understanding Doctrine: Its Relevance & Purpose For Today*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.
- _____, ed. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Thought*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993.
- _____. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MS: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1994.
- _____. *Luther's Theology of the Cross*. Oxford UK & Cambridge UK: Blackwell, 1995.
- _____. *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- _____. *Studies in Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1997.
- McLoughlin, William C. *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandson Finney to Billy Graham*. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.
- McNeill, John T. *The History and Character of Calvinism*. 1954. Reprint, London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. New York: Macmillan, 1939.
- _____. *Errand Into the Wilderness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- _____. *The Life of the Mind in America*. New York: Harcourt, Bruce & World, Inc. 1965.

- _____. *Jonathan Edwards*. 1949. Reprint, Amherst, MA: University Massachusetts Press, 1981.
- _____. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. 1953. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Min, Kyung-Bae. "Ecumenical Wundongui Umiwa Hankukjock Kwaje [The meaning of ecumenical movement and the problem in Korea]." *Christian Thought* (November 1966): 40-48.
- _____. *Kyohoewa Minjok* [The church and the nation]. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1981.
- _____. *Iljaehaui Hankuk Kidokkyo Minjock Shinangwundongsa* [The history of the Korean Christian nationalism and faith movement under the Japanese rule]. Seoul: Daehan Kidokk Seuhoi, 1991.
- _____. *A History of Social Movements in Korean Churches*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society, 1991.
- _____. *Hankuk Kidokkyoheosa* [The history of the Korean Christian church]. 3rd. ed. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1995.
- Moberg, E. *The Great Reversal: Evangelism and Social Concern*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972.
- Moffet, Samuel Hugh. *The Christians of Korea*. New York: Friendship Press, 1962.
- Moody, Dwight L. *New Sermons*. St. Louis: N. D. Thompson, 1877.
- _____. *Notes from My Bible and One Thousand and One Thoughts from My Library*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Morimoto, Anri. *Jonathan Edwards and the Catholic Vision of Salvation*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Morris, Leon. *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. 1955. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- _____. *New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academic Books, 1986.
- Muller, A. Richard. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.

Mullins, Edgar Y. *The Christian Religion: In Its Doctrinal Expression*. Philadelphia: Roger Williams Press, 1917.

Mullins, Mark R., and Richard F. Young, eds. *Perspectives on Christianity in Korea and Japan*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

Murray, Iain H. *The Puritan Hope: Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth, 1971.

_____. *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.

_____. *The Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism, 1750-1858*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1994.

Murray, John. *The Imputation of Adam's Sin*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1959.

_____. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 1959. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.

_____. *Calvin on Scripture and Divine Sovereignty*. 1960. Reprint, Hertfordshire, England: 1979.

_____. *Collected Writings of John Murray*. 4 vols. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982.

_____. *Redemption Accomplished and Applied*. 1955. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992.

Nahm, Andrew C., ed. *Korea under Japanese Colonial Rule*. Kalamazoo, MI: Center for Korean Studies, Western Michigan University, 1974.

_____. *A History of the Korean People: Tradition and Transformation*. Elizabeth, NJ: Hollym International Corp., 1996.

Nakada, Edward and Esther Erny Juji. *No Guarantee But God*. Tokyo: Oriental Missionary Society, 1969.

Nam, Young-Whan. *Hankuk Kidokkyo Kyodansa* [A history of the Korean church and denomination]. Seoul: So Mang Sa, 1988.

Neil, Stephen. *Colonialism and Christian Missions*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Nicholls, Bruce J., ed. *In Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

- No, Chi-Joon. *Iljaeha Hankuk Kidukkyo Minjokundong Yeonku* [A study of the Korean Protestant nationalistic movement under Japanese rule]. Seoul: The Institute for Korean Church History, 1993.
- Noll, Mark A., ed. *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.
- _____. *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. 1992. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- _____, ed. *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1997.
- Noss, John B. *Man's Religions*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1974.
- Oberman, Heiko Augustinus. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Beil and Medieval Nominalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963. Reprint, Durham, NC: The Labyrinth Press, 1983.
- Oh, Byung-Hack. *Ik-Doo Kim*. Seoul: Kyujang, 1995.
- Oh, Deok Kuo. *A History of the Presbyterians*. Suwon, Korea: Hapdong Presbyterian Theological Seminary Press, 2000.
- Oliver, Robert T. *A History of the Korean People in Modern Times: 1800 to the Present*. Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Orr, James. *The Progress of Dogma*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1901.
- Otto, Randall E. "The Solidarity of Mankind in Jonathan Edwards' Doctrine of Original Sin." *Evangelical Quarterly* 62 (1990): 205-231.
- _____. "Justification and Justice: An Edwardsean Proposal." *Evangelical Quarterly* 65 (1993): 131-145.
- Owen, John. *Justification By Faith*. Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- _____. *The Treasures of John Owen: Communion with God*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1991.
- Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Protestants: The Birth of A Revolution*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

- Packer, J. I. *Knowing God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1973.
- _____. et al. *Here We Stand: Justification by Faith Today*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1986.
- _____. *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1990.
- _____. *Evangelism & The Sovereignty of God*. 1961. Reprint, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991.
- _____. *Keep in Step with the Spirit*. 1984. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Fleming H. Revell, 1995.
- _____. "Justification." In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. 1984. Reprint, Grand Rapids Baker Books, 1996.
- Paik, L. George. *The History of Protestant Missions in Korea, 1832-1910*. Pyung Yang: Union Christian College Press, 1929. 4th ed. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1987.
- Pakard, A. Appleton. "The Paralysis of Inability." *Religious in Life* 28 (1958-59): 104-110.
- Palmer, Spencer J. *Korea and Christianity: The Problem of Identification with Tradition*. Seoul: Hollym Corp. Publications, 1967.
- Park, Hyung-Nong. "An Historical Examination of Reformed Theology." *The Logos* 12 (1960): 10-16.
- _____. "Fifty Years of Presbyterian Theological Review." *The Presbyterian Theological Review* 35 (January 1968): 3-8.
- _____. *Park Hyung-Nong Baksa Jeojak Jeonjip* [The works of Dr. Hyung-Nong Park]. Seoul: Hankuk Kidokkyo Yeonkuwon, 1977.
- _____. *A History of Criticism on the Gospels*. Seoul: Sung Kwang Publishing Co., 1985.
- Park, Myung-Soo. "The Korea Pentecost: A Study on the Great Revival of 1903-1910 in Relationship with Contemporary Worldwide Holiness Revival Movements." *Christianity and History in Korea* Vol. 14: 47-77.
- Park, Yong-Kyu. *Anack Sangol: Kim Ik-Doo Mocksa Junki* [A biography of Rev. Ik-Doo Kim]. Seoul: Word of Life Books, 1991.

- _____. *Hankuk Jangrokkyo Sasangsa* [A history of Presbyterian theological thought in Korea]. Seoul: Chongshin Publishing Co., 1992.
- _____. *A History of Great Leaders of the Korean Church*. Seoul: Bockum Munseo Sunkyohoe, 1995.
- _____. *The Great Revivalism in Korea: Its History, Character, and Impact, 1901-1910*. Seoul: Word of Life, 2000.
- Park, Yun-Sun. "The Weaknesses of Fundamentalism." *Logos* 16 (December 1964): 5-11.
- _____. *Commentaries on the Bible*. 20 Vols. Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1987.
- _____. *Sungkyung Shinhak* [Biblical theology]. Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1987.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, 100-600*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1971.
- _____. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 5, *Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture, Since 1700*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1989.
- Petry, Ray C., ed. *Late Medieval Mysticism*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Pettit, Norman. *The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.
- Pink, A. W. *The Doctrine of Election and Justification*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1974.
- Placher, William C. *Readings in the History of Christian Theology: From the Reformation to the Present*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1998.
- Pope, Earl A. "Albert Barnes, The Way of Salvation, and Theological Controversy." *Journal of Presbyterian History* 57 (1979): 20-34.
- _____. *New England Calvinism and the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church*. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1987.
- Quebedeaux, Richard. *The Young Evangelicals*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Rabinowitz, Richard. *The Spiritual Self in Everyday Life: The Transformation of Personal Religious Experience in Nineteenth-Century New England*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989.

- Reid, Daniel, Robert Linder, Bruce Shelley, and Harry Stout, eds. *Dictionary of Christianity in America*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Reisinger, Ernest C. *Lord and Christ*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1994.
- _____. *The Law and the Gospel*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1997.
- Rhie, Deok-Joo. *A Study of the Formation of the Indigenous Church in Korea: 1903-1907*. Seoul: Hankukkidockyo Yonkuso, 2000.
- _____, ed. *Hankuk Kyohoesa Sackinjaryojip* [Index data for Korean church history]. Seoul: Hankuk Kamniyowhoesa Yonkuhoe, 1998.
- Rhodes, Harry A. *A History of the Korean Mission, Prebyterian Church in the U. S. A.* Seoul: Chosen Mission Presbyterian Church, 1933.
- Richardson, Cyril C., ed. *Early Christian Father*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1970.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Translated by H. de Jongste. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1962.
- _____. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Translated by John R. De Witt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- _____. *Redemptive History and the New Testament Scriptures*. 1963. Reprint, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1988.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification & Reconciliation*. Translated by John S. Black. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas, 1872.
- _____. *The Christian Doctrine of Justification & Reconciliation*. Translated by H. R. Mackintosh. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900.
- Robertson, O. Palmer. *The Christ of the Covenants*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.
- Rolston, Holmes III. *John Calvin Versus the Westminster Confession*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1972.
- Rooy, Sidney H. *The Theology of Missions in the Puritan Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

- Rudisill, Dorus Paul. *The Doctrine of the Atonement in Jonathan Edwards and His Successors*. New York: Poseidon Books, Inc., 1971.
- Rutt, Richard. *James Scarth Gale and His History of the Korean People*. Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 1972.
- Sandeen, Ernest R. *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millennialism 1800-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Schafer, Thomas A. "Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith." *Church History* 20 (1951): 55-67.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. *A Selected Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Shearer, Roy E. *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966.
- Schreiner, Thomas R., and Bruce A. Ware, eds. *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will*. 2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- Seeberg, Reinhold. *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*. Translated by Charles E. Hay. 1952. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961.
- Seo, Sung-Sick. "Lee Yong-Do Shinhacksasangae Daehan Yucksa Shinhackjuck Kochal [A historical theological study on the theology of Yong-Do Lee in light of Luther, Bernard, and Wesley]." Th. M. thesis, Korea Methodist Theological Seminary, 1998.
- Shearer, Roy E. *Wildfire: Church Growth in Korea*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- Shedd, William. *Dogmatic Theology*. Vol. 2. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1888.
- Shim, Han-Bo, ed. *Kidock Shinbo: The Christian Messenger*. 16 vols. Seoul: Hankuk Kyohoesa Munhunyonkuwon, 1989.
- Skilton, John H., ed. *Scripture and Confession: A Book About Confessions Old and New*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1973.
- Smith, H. Shelton. *Changing Concepts of Original Sin: A Study in American Theology Since 1750*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- Smith, John E. *Jonathan Edwards: Puritan, Preacher, Philosopher*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.

- Smith, Timothy. *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War*. 1957. Reprint, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Snowden, James H. *The Coming of the Lord: Will It Be Premillennial?*. New York: Macmillan, 1919.
- Song, Gil-Sop. *Hankuk Shinhak Sasangsa* [A history of theological thought in Korea]. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1987.
- Southern, R. W. *Western Society and the Middle Ages*. 1970. Reprint, New York: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Spitz, Lewis W. *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements: The Reformation*. Vol. 2. 1971. Reprint, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1987.
- Sprague, William B. *Lectures on Revivals*. 1832. Reprint, Edinburgh, Scotland: Banner of Truth, 1952.
- Sproul, R. C. *Faith Alone: The Evangelical Doctrine of Justification*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995.
- _____. *Grace Unknown: The Heart of Reformed Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.
- _____. *Willing to Believe: The Controversy over Free Will*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.
- Stein, Stephen J., ed. *Jonathan Edwards's Writings*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- Steele, Richard B. "Gracious Affection" and "True Virtue" According to Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1994.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir*. Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.
- Storms, C. Samuel. *Tragedy in Eden: Original Sin in the Theology of Jonathan Edwards*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985.
- Stott, John, and Robert T. Coote, eds. *Gospel and Culture*. Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1979.
- _____. *Between Two Worlds: The Art of Preaching in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.

- _____. *The Cross of Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1986.
- Strehle, Stephen. *Calvinism, Federalism and Scholasticism: A Study of the Reformed Doctrine of Covenant*. New York: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Sutton, William R. "Benevolent Calvinism and the Moral Government of God: The Influence of Nathaniel W. Taylor on Revivalism in the Second Great Awakening." *Religious and American Culture* 2 (Winter, 1992): 23-47.
- Sweet, W. W. *Revivalism in America*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1944.
- Tamburello, Denise E. *Union with Christ: John Calvin and the Mysticism of St. Bernard*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Taylor, Nathaniel. *Lectures on the Moral Government of God*. New York: Clark, Austin & Smith, 1859.
- "The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelicals Celebration" available at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2000/106/54.ohtm>.
- The Institute of Korean Church History Studies. *A History of Korean Church*. 2 vols. Seoul: The Christian Literature Press, 1989.
- Thiessen, Henry C. *Lectures in Systematic Theology*. 1949. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986.
- Tracy, Joseph. *The Great Awakening: A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield*. 1842. Reprint, Edinburgh, Scotland: Banner of Truth, 1976.
- Travis, Stephen H. *Christian Hope and the Future*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1980.
- Tyler, Bennet. *Letters on the Origin and Progress of the New Haven Theology*. New York: Robert Carter & Ezra Collier, 1837.
- _____. *New England Revivals*. 1846. Reprint, Wheaton, IL: Richard Owen Roberts Publishers, 1980.
- Tyner, Wayne C. "The Theology of Timothy Dwight in Historical Perspective." Ph. D. diss. University of North Carolina, 1971.
- Underwood, Horace G. *The Religion of Eastern Asia*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1910.
- _____. *The Call of Korea*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.

Van Til, Cornelius. *The New Modernism*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1947.

_____. *The Defense of the Faith*. 1955. Reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1967.

_____. *Common Grace and the Gospel*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1977.

_____. *The Reformed Pastor & Modern Thought*. 1971. Reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. *Introduction to Systematic Theology*. Reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1982.

_____. *Christianity and Barthianism*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1982.

Vidler, Alec R. *The Church in An Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present Day*. 1961. Reprint, New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

Vos, Geerhardus. *The Kingdom of God and the Church*. Reprint, Nutely, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1972.

_____. *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.

_____. *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments*. 1948. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983.

_____. *The Pauline Eschatology*. 1930. Reprint, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1991.

Wainwright, William J. *Reason and the Heart: A Prolegomenon to a Critique of Passional Reason*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. 1918. Reprint, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985.

Warfield, Benjamin B. *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1948.

_____. *The Person and Work of Christ*. 1950. Reprint, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1970.

- _____. *Perfectionism*. 1958. Reprint, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.
- _____. "Edwards and the New England Theology." *Studies in Theology*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1988.
- _____. *The Plan of Salvation*. 1915. Reprint, Boonton, NJ: Simpson Publishing Co., 1989.
- _____. *The Saviour of the World*. 1916. Reprint, Carlisle, PA: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1991.
- Watts, Michael. *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution*. 1978. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Weber, Timothy P. *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Webster, William. *The Gospel of the Reformation: Salvation From the Guilt and Power of Sin*. Battle Ground, WA: Christian Resources Inc., 1997.
- Wells, David F. & Woodbridge, John D. *The Evangelicals*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Wells, David F., ed. *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988.
- Whittemore, Robert C. *The Transformation of New England Theology*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.
- Williamson, G. I. *The Westminster Confession of Faith*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1964.
- _____. *The Shorter Catechism*. 2 vols. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1970.
- Wright, N. T. *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- _____. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

- Yang, Hoe-Sung. "Lee Yong-Doui Saeaeewa Sasangyonku [A Study of the life and thought of Lee Yong-Do]." Th. M. thesis, Korean Methodist Theological Seminary, 1999.
- Yang, Myung-Doo. "Lee Yong-Doui Sibijuiwa Tochackwha [The mysticism and indigenization of Lee Yong-Do]." Th. M. thesis, Han Shin Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Yang, Nak-Heong. *Reformed Social Ethics and the Korean Church*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Yates, Timothy. *Christian Mission in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Yoo, Dong-Sick. *Hankukshinhackui Kwangmack* [The vein of Korean theology]. Seoul: Dasan Kulbang, 2000.
- Yun, Sang-Bum. *Kidkkyowa Hankuk Sasang* [A history of Korean Christianity and Korean thought]. Seoul: Christian Literature Society, 1964.
- Zakai, Avihu. *Jonathan Edwards's Philosophy of History: The Reenchantment of the World in the Age of Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Ziesler, J. A. *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.